

*Witney*  
The Contemned  
**QUAKER,**

AND HIS *No 89*  
Christian Religion,  
DEFENDED,

**Against Envy & Forgery,**

In Answer to two Abusive Invektive

**PAMPHLETS,**

The One tiled,

*Antichrist in Spirit Unmasked ;*

The Other,

*Railings and Slanders Detected,*

Promoted by some Persons, commonly called *Anabaptists*, at *Deptford in Kent*, who have unwarily begun the Contest.

*Jer. 48. 30. His lies shall not so effect it*

**L O N D O N,**  
Printed for Tho. Borthcott, in George-  
yard in Lombard-street. 1692.

*Witney*

C 8348. 800. 176 A

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY  
FROM THE  
ANDREW PRESTON PEABODY  
FUND

Jan 9/1936



THE  
CONTEMNED QUAKER,  
AND HIS  
Christian Religion defended.

W Hereas in a small Treatise, entituled, *Antichrist in Flesh unmask'd, and the Quakers Christianity vindicated, from the Malitious and Injurious Attempts*

of { Edward Paye,  
William Alcott and  
Henry Loader,

in their late Defaming, Confused Book, falsely stiled, *Antichrist in Spirit Unmask'd*. I did near the Conclusion of the said Treatise seriously enquire only of William Alcott and Henry Loader, in these four Questions following, viz.

A 2

I. "Was

I. " Was *Edward Paye* Deputed and  
 " approved by your Congregation, or  
 " any Select Assembly of Elders or Mi-  
 " nisters of the Baptized People or  
 " Churches, to Write and Publish his  
 " said Book against the People called  
 " Quakers, or did he do it on his own  
 " Authority and Head, with your Ap-  
 " probation only ?

II. " What Ministers or Elders of  
 " your Churches, besides your selves,  
 " did peruse and approve of *Edward*  
 " *Paye's* said Book, before printed, and  
 " of the Printing thereof, to Defame  
 " us as a People ?

III. " Is the said *Edward Paye*, in-  
 " deed esteem'd among you and your  
 " Society a good Christian, a Person of  
 " a Godly and Sober Conversation, of  
 " Sound Judgment, Piety and Parts,  
 " meet to manage Matters of Controver-  
 " sy about Religion ?

IV. " Do you intend to stand by him  
 " the said *Edward Paye* in all Matters  
 " that he has written, in Charge, both  
 " against certain Persons and against  
 " the People called Quakers, in his  
 " Book ?

Having also given my Reasons for  
 these Questions in the said Treatise,  
*Antichrist in Flesh*, p. 26. Now let it  
 be

be observ'd, that to these Questions I find no answer from the said *William Allcot* or *Henry Loader*, to whom they were put ; but a pretended and evasive Answer from *Edward Paye* himself, having only his own Name subscribed a few Lines after, but no *William Allcot* nor *Henry Loader* subscribed thereto, but *Edward Paye* left to shift for himself, and they sunk back, for all they highly commended his Work and defamed us in their Commendatory Epistle to his other Pamphlet (i.e. *Anti-christ in Spirit*) against us. And yet as if he had a Plurality of Advocates to answer for him, he gives us his slim Answer in the Plural thus, viz. *We will give an answer to G. W's impertinent Questions, though I think they are not worth taking notice of: His Questions are four, but his Reasons for asking them vanish in answering the first.*—And in the pretended Answer it is said, *E. P. did Write and Publish his Book by the Approbation of the majority of this Congregation; and so he did not do it on his own Head; neither did we see it needful to desire the Approbation of others herein, though several have approved of it since, p. 37, 38.* But what *We* are these give this Answer besides *Edward Paye*? we find no

Body's Name else to it but his own :  
 If by [ *W E* will give an Answer ; nei-  
 ther did we see it needful to desire the Ap-  
 probation of others ] be meant *William*  
*Allcot* and *Henry Loader* ; why did  
 they not put their Names to it ? Why  
 do they now shrink back and decline  
 their Brother in his Work, seeing the  
 Enquiry was so fairly made of them ?  
 Can they or *Edward Paye* either reason-  
 ably suppose, that we ( as a People de-  
 famed and injured by *E. P.* ) will ac-  
 cept of his own Answer or Justification  
 of his perverse Work, and himself too,  
 and believe that he says true, in saying,  
*That he did Write and Publish his said*  
*Book by the Approbation of the majority of*  
*their Congregation at Deptford* ? For  
 my Part I do not believe him herein ;  
 in Point of Charity I do not suppose  
 the majority of the Congregation or  
 Hearers of the Baptists at *Deptford* are  
 so grossly corrupted and deluded into  
 Envy and Prejudice as really to believe  
 and approve of such a Bundle of Mali-  
 cious and Numerous Slanders, Forge-  
 ries, Notorious Lyes, Perversions and  
 Abuses as are contain'd and apparent in  
 the said Pamphlet, styl'd, *Antichrist in*  
*Spirit*, by *Edward Paye* ( and many of  
 them repeated in his second ) and  
 highly

highly approved by *William Allcott* and *Henry Loader* : But if either the majority or minority of their Congregation have given their Approbation for the Writing and Publication thereof ( as is pretended ) I and others of us should be very sorry for their sakes, that they should be so miserably deluded, as not only to believe, but approve of the Publication of such gross Slanders and Defamations against their Innocent Neighbours, as are contained in the said Pamphlet : And that they should be so implicit and blindly credulous of such gross and notorious Falshoods and Reproaches, invented by envious Persons and Persecutors. And you *E. P. W. A.* and *H. L.* who have so far deluded any of your Hearers, have much to answer for, and a sad account to give, before the Righteous Judge of all.

But now, seeing the Writing and Publication of *E. P.*'s said Envious Pamphlet ( *i. e.* *Antichrist in Spirit* ) is at last so far dedicated to the majority of the Baptist's Congregation at *Deptford*, as having their Approbation, it may not be unseasonable to shew them and others some of *Edward Paye*'s and *William Allcot*'s notorious Falshoods, Slanders and Perversions contained therein ; and

in his last Pamphlet also, stiled, *Railings and Slanders*, &c. which I shall here recite in their own Words, as in Charge against them and all that approve or publish them, to their Shame and Disgrace.

Charg 1. *The Holy Scriptures this Generation of Men ( i. e. the Quakers ) contemn and vilifie ( Commendatory Epistle, by William Allcott and Henry Loader to Antichrist in Spirit ; ) and that the Quakers are great Enemies to and Contemnners of Holy Scriptures, p. 20.*

*Answer.* This is their General ( and a most odious ) Charge, which in our very Souls and Consciences, in the Sight of God, we the said People do utterly deny with Detestation ; and I find that all their pretended Proofs do fail of any real Proof of the Matter charged, the chief whereof being hereafter examin'd more particularly.

2. *That the Quakers prefer their Lying Pamphlets above the Scriptures, p. 9. Their pretended Proof is, That G. W. affirms, That which is spoken from the Spirit of Truth in any, is of as great Authority as the Scripture, and greater, p. 11. quoting Apology, p. 49.*

*Answ.* In which *Apology* no Pamphlets at all are preferred above the Scriptures, but the



the immediate Living Ministry of the *Holy Spirit within* above the *Letter*, the *Divine Inspiration* which was before the Scriptures were written, for they proceeded from it. I am very unfairly and unjustly dealt with in this Charge ; my Intentions and Words perverted, after the Word [ *Scriptures* ] in mine, [ *or Chapters* ] are here left out ; and after the Word *Greater* all these following are left out, *viz.* [ “ as received “ and proceeding *immediately* from that “ Spirit, and spoken in the Sense there- “ of ; as Christ’s Words were of great- “ er Authority ( or Power ) when he “ spake, than the Pharisees reading the “ Letter ; and them in whom that Spi- “ rit speaks not, and their Speaking “ we deny ; ] whereby I did prefer the Spirit in it’s Living and Powerful Ministry above the Letter, but not a Word of preferring any Pamphlets to the Holy Scriptures : God knows, it never entered into my Heart to prefer any Pamphlets or Books, extant in the World, ( much less Lying Ones ) before the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, but do prefer and esteem them before all other Books or Writings extant, whatsoever.

*When*

3. *When Humphry Smith's True and Everlasting Rule came in date, the Scriptures became no better than an Old Almanack. [ this from a Story of Tho. Hicks against one Tho. Holbrow ( though we know no such Person ) Dialogue, p. 27. to which Edward Paye, &c. addeth these Words, viz. ] These are the Men that in their Pamphlets profess so high an Esteem for the Holy Scriptures, Antichrist in Spirit, p. 13.*

*Observ.* Pray observe here, *These Men*, here accused ( *with esteeming the Scriptures no better than an Old Almanack* ) are therein most wickedly belied and scandaliz'd, being those of us who publish the Paper in Print, entituled, *The Christianity of the People commonly called Quakers asserted*, wherein we sincerely declare ( the quite contrary to what's here implicitly charged by *E. P. &c.* against us, ) namely, " That we do believe and own  
" the Holy Scriptures, contained in  
" the Books of the Old and New Testa-  
" ment to be given by *Divine Inspira-*  
" *tion*, &c.

4. *Tho. Hicks in his Dialogue I. p. 24, 25. and Edward Paye, &c. ( on his Credit ) Falsly and Wickedly Personate the Quaker thus, viz. When we make use of Scripture, it is only to Quiet and Stop their Clamours*

Clamours that plead for it as their Rule ;  
 but for us had the Scriptures never been we  
 could have known what \* is therein con- \* Where  
 tained. I hope ( quoth Edward Paye ) proves he  
 the Reader by this may perceive the Reason these to be  
 why the Quakers talk so much of Scripture the Quak-  
 in their Paper. Observe, we own not the ers words?  
 Scripture, we seemingly allow it, but our from which  
 End in this is only to stop their Clamours he himself  
 that plead for it as their Rule. You see varies, p.  
 here ( quoth E. P. ) the condescending 11. viz.  
 Spirits of these Men, &c. Antichrist That all  
 P. 15. cessary may  
 be taught  
 without

them, and what less have Baptists heretofore confessed, by  
 approving Samuel How's Sermon for *The Sufficiency of the*  
*Spirit's Teaching?* printed 1655.

We do in the Name of our Lord Je-  
 sus Christ utterly deny this Passage and  
 Declaration, as laid down in the Qua-  
 kers Name and Person, as no Declara-  
 tion or Speech made or thus declarable  
 by the Quakers, on their Principle,  
 but a *Horrid Abusive Forgery of Thomas*  
*Hicks*, long since detected, and which  
 you Baptists now may be horribly asham-  
 ed to bring forth, or suffer to be renew-  
 ed in Print.

*The*

5. *The Names they (i. e. the Quakers) give the Holy Scriptures, viz. No better than an Old Almanack, a Dead Carnal Letter, p. 18.*

A Gross Lye.

*Answ.* But on second Consideration, E. P. deems it a difficulty to prove that the Quakers do now in the present Tense say, The Holy Scriptures are but a Dead or Carnal Letter, as his other Pamphlet-Raylings, p. 23, 24. and yet chargeth them in the present Tense, with giving such Names to the Holy Scriptures; but now 'tis a Difficulty to prove his own Charge.

6. Among the Names which E. P. falsely chargeth the Quakers to give the Holy Scriptures, viz. That they are the Precepts and Traditions of Men, p. 18. That Obedience to the Scriptures is the Harlot's Child, p. *ibid.*

*Answ.* These are both utterly denied by us the said People, and the pretended Proof of the first is hereafter examined and proved false. The latter I really believe could never be so said, nor ever was held by the Quakers, so to term sincere Obedience to the Holy Scripture, but rather to reflect upon an Hypocritical Profession, and Imitation of some Shadows and outwardward Things, and neglecting the Substance of the New Covenant Dispensation. *That*

That the Heaven, they (i. e. the Quakers) intend (wherein the three Divine Witnesses bear Record) is No where else but within their Mortal Corrupt Bodies; they intend no other Heaven than what is within them, Antichrist in Spirit, p. 20, 21.

7.

This is expressly contrary to our known professed Principle of the omnipresence of God and his Spirit, both in Heaven above and in Earth beneath, and whom the Heaven of Heavens cannot contain.

Answ.

And I take the Charge to be but E.P.'s own Consequence, which he himself has drawn from some Words he has partially and mincingly taken up against James Parnell, Thomas Lawson, Edward Burroughs, &c.

First, For a Pretext, quoting James Parnell's Book (as he calls it) *Satan's Design Discovered*.

But I know no Book of James Parnell's so entituled upon the Reviewing the Titles of his Books, nor any of the rest quoted, that oppose or disown God's Omnipresence; much less that the People called Quakers are guilty of any such Charge.

I would

I would desire *E. P.* if he will still be so injurious as to reassume this Charge against the People called Quakers, that he would yet be so ingenious as fairly and fully to cite the whole Passages of the Authors quoted by him, relating to the Matter intended, and for Proof of his Charge, without his own Consequences and Perversions. That if it shall appear that any of them have opposed or denied the Omnipresence of God or his Eternal Spirit, we may shew our dislike thereof.

But, I believe, there's enough in our Friends Books to clear them, if honestly viewed and cited, and we have great cause to Question, and detect his unfair Citations, 'as I have this following Instance against my self; for Proof of his said Charge 8. Quoting Dipper plung'd; *Christ without us is not Scripture Language, but the Anthropomorphites and Muggletonians*, Antichrist in Spirit, p. 22.

*Observ.*

But *E. P.* in his other Pamphlet, *Railings*, p. 29. varies in his Repetition of his Charge thus, viz. *G. W. Dipper plung'd—Jesus Christ a Person without us is not Scripture-Language, &c.* Observe here, in the one it is *Christ without us* (where after (*Christ*) *E. P.* leaves



leaves out [*God-Man, a Person*] i. e. *without us*, which, I said, is not *Scripture-Language*, &c. In the other it is *Jesus Christ, a Person without us*, is not *Scripture-Language*; where after [*Christ*] he leaves out *God-man* again, and yet both charged by the same Credulous Person *E. P.* though both be falsely cited and unjustly charged upon me as mine.

For to *Tho. Hick's* strange Phrase, viz. *Jesus Christ God-man, a Person without thee*, Dial. p.9. My Answer was, "This is not *Scripture Language*, but the "Anthropomorphites and Muggletonians who profess a *personal God*, denying him to be an Infinite Spirit; *Dipper plung'd*, p. 13.

Wherein my Objection was not against the Words *Jesus Christ without us*, for he is both without us and within us, but my Question was of the Words [*God-man, a Person without us*] including God as well as the Man Christ Jesus, as being but a *Person without us*, which may be ascribed to any Man or Woman that is but a finite mortal Creature; which as it was not *Scripture Language*, I did esteem it too low and mean an Epethite to ascribe to an Infinite and omnipresent God; but does  
this

this deny either God or-Christ to be in Heaven above, or confine God only in the Hearts of his People? No sure; and I was very Conscientious and Tender of the Glory and Dignity of God and Christ therein, as thinking *T. Hicks* and his Brethren would never preach People into the Knowledge of the true God or Jesus Christ, by telling them, That God and his dear Son Christ Jesus, *is a Person without them*; howbeit I am not so pertinacious in my Objection, but if they'l bring me Plain Scripture, that calls the Infinite God *a Person without them*, let it be in any true Translation of Holy Scripture, and I'll acquiesce, for I am not willing to be under any Mistake, *Heb. 1. 3.* καὶ ἡ εἰκὼν τῆς ὑποστάσεως; *Figura substantiae ejus*, Figure of his Substance; 'tis not *Image of his Person*, nor the same with ἐν ὁμοειδίᾳ καὶ ὁμοφύᾳ, *in conspectu Christi*, as some have it; others in *persona Christi*, *2 Cor. 2. 9.* which proves not the Phrase [*God-Man a Person without thee*] to be a Scripture Phrase.

9. Whereas *G. F.* said, "He that hath  
 "not this Christ (that was Risen and  
 "Crucified) *within*, is a Reprobate;  
*Great Mystery*, f. 206.

Here

Here *E. P.* leaves out the Words [*Risen and*] and proceeds, viz. *I think here is a bare-faced Piece of Blasphemy and down-right denying the Lord Christ. What was that the False Christ that dyed at Jerusalem, without the Gates of Jerusalem?*

Ay \*, saith George Fox, if there be any \* This is a other Christ than he that was Crucified with- gross For- in he is the False Christ; p. 28. quoting *G. F.* gery.

his *Mystery*, p. 206. And then *E. P.* Fallsly and Absurdly Discants upon the Words *Crucified within*; whereby he saith is meant, within that *Man*, the Son of Mary, not the *Man* that was Crucified was Christ, p. 28.

None, but one blinded with Envy, *Observ.* would ever have thus Charged *G. F.* or the Quakers with such horrible falsehoods and Forgery; *G. F.* gives no such Answer, as *Ay* to the Question. Before, he owns no other Christ than *him* that was Crucified and Dyed at *Jerusalem*, and the *same* Christ to be *within*, as the Apostles did. *G. Fox's* own Words clear him herein, even in the very Book and Page cited by *E. P.* viz. *Great Mystery*, p. 206. where *G. F.* saith, "If Christ that was Crucified be  
"not within, and Christ that's Risen  
"be not within, I say that you all are  
"Reprobates: And this is not oppo-  
B " site

“ site to Jesus Christ without, that Dy-  
 “ ed at *Jerusalem*, but the *S A M E*.  
 “ And the Apostles Preach’d Christ  
 “ (that was Crucified) within, and not  
 “ another, him that was Raised from  
 “ the Dead, was Risen; *that* Lord Je-  
 “ sus Christ within; it was *HE* that  
 “ was manifest *IN* the Saints, that  
 “ was and is, and not another, &c.

Now let all Impartial Readers Judge  
 how clear *G. F.* and we are from the  
 Blasphemies before-charged, as both  
 that of *denying* the Lord Christ, or  
 esteeming him *the false Christ* that Dy-  
 ed at *Jerusalem*. Oh! *Edward Paye*,  
*William Allcott* and *Henry Loader*, and  
 those of your Congregation, who ap-  
 prov’d of your said Pamphlet, contain-  
 ing such Horrid Abominable Lyes, Per-  
 versions, Slanders and Forgeries, as  
 these against *G. F.* and us: Be ye all  
 horribly ashamed thereof and repent,  
 before it be too late. Your following  
 Charge, deduced from the foregoing,  
 is of the same kind, and as wickedly  
 False and Pernicious, viz.

10.

*Christ that was Born of the Virgin, was*  
*Crucified upon the Cross without the Gates*  
*of Jerusalem, that was in all Points tem-*  
*pled like as we are, yet without Sin. This they*  
*(i. e. the Quakers) will not allow to be*  
*the*

the True Christ or God's Christ ( which is a most horrid Lye, elsewhere detected ). Is not this a plain denying of the Lord that bought them, Antichrist in Spirit, p. 28, 29.

See also Mr. Penn's *Sandy Foundation*, p. 25. 30. To say God should Condemn and Punish his Innocent Son, that he having satisfied for our Sins, we may be justified by the Imputation of his perfect Righteousness, p. 40.

Here E. P. after [ Justified ] thou hast left out [ whilst unsanctified ] and so hast wickedly perverted and altered the Sense of his Words, and belyed us and him shamefully in what follows.

Why should the Quakers be such Grand Deluders, as so plainly pretend to believe it, and say he ( i. e. Christ ) dyed for your Sins, and rose again for your Justification; when, *ibid.* p. 16. Mr. Penn saith, That the Consequences of SUCH a Doctrine are both Irreligious and Irrational; and why should they believe Justification by Christ's Righteousness, p. 40, 41.

This Charge appears as notoriously false in Fact as any of the Rest. I have strictly perused the Places quoted in W. P's *Sandy Foundation*, p. 16, &c.

II.

Observ.

12.

Answ.

And I find no such Thing, as the Doctrine of *Christ's Dying for our Sins and Rising again for our Justification*, charg'd with Consequences either Irreligious or Irrational: But the Doctrine, That God inflicted the Penalty of Infinite Wrath and Vengeance on his dear Son Jesus Christ and that for Sins past, present and to come, he hath wholly born, and paid it, to satisfy the offended infinite Justice, &c. *ibid.* p. 16. 'Twas the Consequences of this Doctrine, and also that of the *Justification of the Wicked or Impure Persons, before Sanctification*, That *W. P.* deemed Irreligious and Irrational, *ibid.* p. 16, 22, 24, to 31. And dare *E. P.* or his Associates own and stand by these Doctrines (as Religious and Rational) which *W. P.* opposed? Though Christ Dyed for all Men, suffered for the Sins of the whole World, it was not under the Penalty of his Father's Infinite Wrath and Vengeance, but as a Sacrifice of a *sweet-smelling Savour to God*: He Rose again for our Justification, but not to Justifie us in Sin, or without True Faith and Real Sanctification by his Spirit in us.

13.

Why should the Quakers be Angry, as they have been, for calling G. F. the King of the Quakers, since he is as really



*ally so on their Account, as Christ is the King of Christians, p. 45.*

We do in our Consciences Testifie against this Charge, as a great and false Scandal upon us, the People called Quakers, Jesus Christ being our King and Law-giver; G. F. was never so accounted by us, but a Servant of Christ, and true Subject in Christ's Kingdom, and Instrumental for the Good of many in his Day and Time.

*Ans<sup>r</sup>.*

*But read p. 6, 7. Saul's Errand to Damascus: And George Fox takes the Name to himself, saying, He is the Eternal Judge of Quick and Dead, p. 46.*

14.

This False Charge is again recited by E. P. in his other Pamphlet *Raylings*, p. 35. and a Defence thereof, therein attempted by him, but to no purpose, for as was told him, it is notoriously False in Fact: And instead of proving the Charge, That G. F. takes the Name to himself, he alledges, That G. F. is so charged in the Lancaster Petition, G. F. is so charged with taking to himself the Name of the Eternal Judge of Quick and Dead. Though here E. P. misses again. He is there charged, That he professeth himself to be the Eternal Judge of the World. And who did so charge him? But his Persecuting Ad-

*Ans<sup>r</sup>.*

versaries in *Lancashire*, whose Charge he denies in the very Title of his Answer thereunto ( as well as in the Matter ) viz. *The Answer of George Fox to the Matters falsely charged upon him by the Petition and Scedule aforesaid.*

Now, *Edward Paye*, mayest thou not be ashamed to make that thy positive Charge, to Defame a Person, which thou hast but upon Trust from his Adversaries, without taking notice of his Defence? Was this Justice, or any Judicial Course of Passing Judgment before both Parties are heard, thinkest thou? It seems thou art as Censorious as Credulous to defame others. And how knowest thou the *Lancaster* Petitioners were Men of Credit and Repute, that thou shouldest have more Reason to believe the Affirmative of so many, than *G. F.'s* Negative? And why wast thou so positive in thy Charge, as if thou hadst spoken *ex certa scientia*, when now thou art put to it to plead the Credit of thy Authors, and for the Reason of thy Belief of their Defamation? Now, who can think ( sayest thou ) that such a Number of Men should agree-together in Charging *G. Fox* with a Falshood? Although it is well known that 'tis no New nor strange Thing for False Witnesses to arise and

and joyn together against the Innocent, as they did against the Prophets, against Christ and his Servants; See *Psal.* 27. 12. *Matt.* 26. 60. *Act.* 6. 13. And we have sufficient Instance thereof at Hand. How apparent is it that *Edward Paye*, and his Brother *William Alcott*, &c. (and those that have approved of the Writing and Publication of *E. P's* Malicious Book, stiled, *Antichrist in Spirit*) have agreed together, as False Witnesses against us, in their manifold, notorious and gross Falshoods, to Defame the People called Quakers?

*That the Quakers do not own the Kingly Office of Christ, that Dyed at Jerusalem, no more, no nor so much neither, as the Kingly Office of G. Fox, pag. 47, 48.*

We utterly deny this Charge, as contrary to our very Intentions and professed Principle. The Matter is farther examined hereafter.

*That they deny the Place where Christ our Highpriest is entred, which is the Heavens, Heb. 4. 14. The Quakers deny Christ to be entred into the Glorious Heavens above, P. 49.*

This is a notorious Falshood, detected elsewhere.

*They*

15.

*Answ.*

16.

*Answ.*

17. *They deny the Blood of the Sacrifice Christ, our High Priest, offered upon the Cross, and scornful Contempt they have cast upon it, p. 50.*

*Ans.* The Lord, who knows the contrary, rebuke this Envious Lying Spirit. How can they deny the Blood, when they have owned it to be a principal Part of that Sacrifice offered for an Attainment?

18. *The Quakers cannot believe the Priestly or Mediatory Office of Christ, because they have no need of a Mediator. If they are Perfect, &c. what need have they of the Mediatory Office of Christ? p. 51.*

*Ans.* This Charge is fallly deduced, for our sincerely believing a Perfection (without Sin) attainable by the Power of Christ in this Life; this cannot oppose Christ's Mediatory Office. 1. Because 'tis by him that we attain unto that Perfection. 2. 'Tis by him that we must be kept in it. 3. It is through him that we enjoy Life, Union and Peace with God, and receive all our Spiritual Blessings *In Christ Jesus*.

19. *See Parnel's Shield of Truth, p. 12. where he calls Water-Baptism a Formal imitation and Invention of Men, and so a meer Delusion, p. 59.*

No ; He does not call *Water Baptism* *Answ.*  
 so, but *sprinkling Infants* ; for in the  
 Place cited he saith, *I received Water*  
*upon my Face, as my Parents, told me,*  
*which they called Baptism:* So that J. P.  
 does not call it Baptism ; no more did  
 the Baptists heretofore.

Smith's Primmer, p. 39. *Thy Bap-* 20.  
*tism, Bread and Wine rose from the Pope's*  
*Invention,* p. 59. Again, the Charge  
 is made far worse in E. P's recital of  
 it, viz. *Thy Bread and Wine in the Lord's*  
*Supper are the Pope's Invention. See how*  
*barefacedly they can lye against the Truth,*  
 p. 71.

I find *William Smith* wronged in both *Answ.*  
 these Charges, and that very grossly, in  
 being charged for writing, That *Bread*  
*and Wine in the Lord's Supper are the*  
*Pope's Invention.* This is a notorious  
 Forgery, for what *William Smith* ren-  
 ders the *Pope's Invention,* was, "Sprin-  
 " kling Water in a Child's Face, mak-  
 " ing the Sign of the Cross in it's Fore-  
 " head, Godfathers and Godmothers  
 " to undertake for it: Bread and  
 " Wine, so used and received (i.e.  
 " by a Sort of Priests and People )  
 " as the Body and Blood of Christ,  
 " which they tell them is Broken and  
 " shed for them, and did not these  
 " rise

“rise from the Pope's Invention, throw ye?”

21. In opposition to our Belief and Profession of *Christ's Merits and Work*, for the Salvation of Man, our Envious Adversaries endeavour to fasten some strange Inconsistencies upon us, or Absurdities (as I may call them,) as perversely Stated and Construed by them, quite contrary to our said Profession, and to insinuate that our Belief of *Redemption and Salvation by Christ*, is neither *Redemption of Body nor Soul*, but only of a lost God and Christ, p. 41, 42. which are very Foul and Notorious Perversions and Falshoods. One Instance E.P. gives, is against G.F. about the Soul, that it is part of God without Beginning or End, and then it needs no Redemption, for God did not send his Son to Redeem himself, p. 41. This gross Perversion was *Thomas Hicks's*, and now taken upon Credit by these too credulous Anabaptists, E. P. W. A. &c. But did G.F. say, That the Soul of the Creature Man was part of God, or of his being without Beginning or End? No sure, but that Divine Breath or Spirit which God Breathed into Man, whereby Man became a Living Soul: Wherein is a plain Distinction between that Divine Breath



or Spirit of God and the Creature Man, or his created Soul; as may be seen more at large in G. F's Great Mystery, quoted, where he speaks of "the Soul of Man being in Death in Transgression, so Man's Spirit there not Sanctified, (and declares Christ the Bishop of the Soul; Great Mystery, p. 91.) which therefore needs Redemption by Christ, which cannot be said of God or Christ himself, that he Needs or Wants Redemption; what Gross and Silly Nonsense would that be to affirm?

These Adversaries may be ashamed of such gross Perversion and Abuse, as their thus rendring the Quakers, to confound the Being of the Creator and the Creature, as if they were one and the same Being.

Another Instance is against G. Keith, "Speaking of Christ, That he came to Save that which was Lost in Man's Heart; and after speaking of Christ's Ministers, preaching People to a lost God, a lost Christ, and then E. P. &c. cries out of G. K's being Inspired by the Prince of Darkness, to talk of a lost God and a lost Christ, to be Sought and Saved, p. 42.

22.

Oh

*Answ.*

Oh horrid and abominable Falsifying and Perversion ! See *G. K's* own Answer and Detection to *Tho. Hicks*, in this very Matter, entituled, *George Keith's Vindication from the Forgeries and Abuses of Thomas Hicks*, shewing, that when he speaks of *a lost God*, and *a lost Christ* ; he saith, "whom they (*i. e.* People) "had lost, and from whom "they were separated by their Sins : And this *Hicks* and his Brother *E. P.* take no Notice of, in their Citation or False Inferences, much less of *G. K's Vindication*, p. 8, 9. viz. "The Plain and "Open Sense of my Words is this, "That as Jesus Christ came to Seek and "Save the *lost Souls of Men*, and to "Raise up and Recover the Image of "God in Men again, so all the true "Ministers of Christ Preached People "to God and Christ, near them, *whom* "though *Men had lost*, yet were near "unto them, to save them, and to "bring them into the enjoyment of "him, and Fellowship with him.

23.

His other Instance, in p. 42. is against *James Naylor's Love to the Lost*, fallly quoting p. 30, 47, 48. citing him thus, viz. *That there is a Seed, to which the Promise of Redemption is ; which Seed is that which ONLY wants Redemption,*  
and

and that Christ is the Elect Seed: And then draws this Consequence from a false Position, That Christ came to Redeem Christ.

We do not find the Citation true, no more than we own the Position; we find not that his Words are, *That this Seed Christ ONLY wants Redemption; but WHEREIN only Redemption is seen and received, namely, That in the promised Seed Redemption is only to be seen and received by Man, or the Creature that wants it.* *Ans<sup>r</sup>.*

Now I find a Distinction in J. N's. Writing of the Seed, as between the Seed Christ, who is the Redeemer, and the Seed of Abraham (i. e. Believers) whom Christ Redeems; the Children of the Kingdom, the Children of the Promise are counted for the Seed. And this Distinction appears in J. N's own Words following: "That 'tis the Seed of Israel whom Christ redeems" (as J. N. saith, and tells man) no further art thou Redeemed by Christ Jesus. And that Salvation IN the Seed is placed; and the *Heritage* of Faith is the Seed that is Redeemed, which all who know Redemption by the precious Blood of Christ are redeemed from the vain Conversation; for this End "he

" he gave himself for us, to redeem us  
 " from *ALL Iniquity*; (thus far *J.N. Love to the Lost*) p. 59, 60, 61, 62. *con-*  
*cerning Redemption*, but no such Words,  
 as that the *Seed*, which is Christ *ONLY*  
*wants Redemption*.

Is it not a great Shame and Reproach  
 to Religion, that any Preachers should  
 be so Credulous and Envious as to re-  
 ceive such down-right Lyes and gross  
 Perversions, to Reproach their quiet  
 Neighbours, and thus confidently to  
 Expose them to the World, as these  
 Anabaptist Preachers have done; and  
 thereupon to roar out and cry, *Blas-*  
*phemous Absurdities, Gross Contradictions*  
*to Truth?* p. 43. When such Absur-  
 dities and Gross Contradictions are  
 their own Malicious Forgeries against  
 us, Fomented and Exposed by *Thomas*  
*Hicks* (and on Trust from him) by  
*Edward Paye, Henry Loader, and Willi-*  
*am Allcott.*

Whereas Christ hath all Power in  
 Heaven and Earth given him, and he is  
 our Saviour and Redeemer, and as he  
 had Power to lay down his Life and take  
 it up again, so his own Seed of Life,  
 Word or Plant in the Soul (though  
 for a Time under Suffering and the Load  
 of Man's Iniquity) he hath Power to  
 Raise

Raise it up, and therein to bring forth an Immortal Birth and Holy Generation, which is *his Seed*, whom he shall see as the Fruit of his Soul's Travel. Such his Condescension and Humiliation under Suffering, both inwardly and outwardly argues no Deficiency nor Impotency in Christ himself, who is the very entire Christ of God, in whom all Fulness dwells, and who received the Spirit not by Measure; but 'twas his own free Love, and Act of pure Condescension and Humility, to descend into the Heart of Man, to Redeem and Raise up Man, his Soul and Spirit out of his Fallen and Captivated Estate, and from under the Bondage of Corruption, who in that State *ONLY* wants Redemption, and not Christ; for how much soever he Suffers, or is Spiritually pierc'd or grieved by Men's Iniquities, he can take unto him his great Power when he pleaseth, and ease himself of his Enemies, and his own Arm can bring Salvation to him.

We never Entertained or Believed any such Doctrine as these Adversaries enviously and falsely insinuate, as that the *Seed Christ ONLY* wants Redemption; for so to render him Impotent, were to oppose his All-sufficient Power and Dignity,

nity, but that 'tis the *Soul of Fallen Man and Woman, that wants Redemption*, and not Christ, who is the Redeemer and Saviour of it; this does plainly appear to be our Belief, from our Apprehension of the Nature and Being of the *Soul of Man* as a Creature, and not the Creator, *viz.* That the Soul of the Creature Man is not God nor Christ,  
 " But the Spiritual *Being* and Principal  
 " Part of Man, Created in the Image  
 " of God, and Divinely Inspired and  
 " Enlightned by its Creator and Redeemer, who formed the Spirit (or  
 " Soul) of Man within him; for the  
 " Soul or Spirit of Man, as distinguished from the Body, is often in Scripture rendred one and the same thing,  
 " more livingly perceived and felt in  
 " that Divine Light and Life of Christ,  
 " whereby our Souls live to God, than  
 " by any Philosophical or School  
 " Definitions.

Edward



---

Edward Paye's *Second Pamphlet, styled, Raylings and Slanders Detected, Examined.*

**W** Hereas in my late Brief Treatise, entituled, *Antichrist in Flesh unmasked,* I did complain against the Envy and Persecuting Spirit of *Edward Paye* and his Abettors, *William Allcott* and *Henry Loader*, as appearing Envious against our present Liberty; 1. By seeking to make void one Condition thereof, which was our Profession of Faith, "*In the three Divine Witnesses in Heaven, &c.* ( according to 1 *Joh. 5. 7* ) "*and acknowledging the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by Divine Inspiration*; being sincerely owned by us before the Parliament "*(when proposed to us, and accordingly*

“ingly accepted, and more fully inserted in the Statute for *Exempting their Majesties Protestant Subjects, dissenting, &c. from the Penalties of certain Laws*) and therein confessed to be a Profession of their Christian Belief.

2. That in Contradiction thereunto these Persons aforesaid have grossly Belied and Misrepresented us, the People called *Quakers*, accusing us with *vilifying and contemning the Holy Scriptures; and with saying, We own not the Scriptures, but seemingly allow them; and that the Quakers are great Enemies to, and contemnners of Holy Scriptures*, Epist. and p. 14. and 20. of their first Pamph. *Antichrist in Spirit*; both contrary to our Sincere and Christian Profession, and to the Civil Governments Belief and Acceptance thereof, thereby contradicting, and consequently affronting the Government in its Belief and Charity towards us, and to set Subjects at Variance, and to raise Persecution against us again, instead of being humbly thankful for their and our present Liberties. The very Nature and Tendency of these their Bitter Lying Investives being to bring Persecution upon us, as a People not to be given any Credit unto, in our Solemn Profession before Authority.

3. When

3. When we have solemnly and sincerely declared to the Government, *That we believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are given by Divine Inspiration*, two or three Anabaptists (so called) divulge the contrary to the World in Print, &c.

Unto which *E. P.* replies, viz. to all which I answer: 1. *We did not know till our Book was published, that you had professed this as your Faith before the Parliament.*

The more Shame for you, to be so precipitant in your Unjust and Censorious Attempts to the Contrary; your Ignorance herein will not excuse your Rashness, much less your Falshood, in charging us as a People (*i. e.* the Quakers in general) *with being great Enemies to, Vilifiers and Contemners of the Holy Scriptures, and now their chief Guides* (as *E. P.* terms them) *and our former Writings, directly to oppose and evidently to contradict this Confession of Faith, p. 3, 4. which is, our believing the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by Divine Inspiration.*

Now I challenge *E. Paye* and his Abettors, *W. Allcot* and *H. L.*

1. To produce plain Proof, That the People called Quakers do Vilifie the Holy  
C 2                      Scriptures:

Scriptures: This is Matter of Fact charged, What Vilifying Terms or Characters hath that People put upon the Holy Scriptures? We do in good Conscience still deny the Charge.

2. What Expressions of Contempt hath that People put upon the Holy Scriptures, it being contrary to our Consciences and Intentions, either to Contemn or Vilifie them? The Matter of Fact charged ought directly to be proved against us, as a People, or else retracted, and for ever condemned.

3. What former Writings of ours, or our Ministers, do directly Oppose and Contradict this our Profession, *That we believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament were given by Divine Inspiration?* Where do we the said People or our Ministers declare, That the Holy Scriptures were not given by Divine Inspiration, or only given by Human Tradition? We demand plain Proof of the Indictment or Matters herein charged against us, and by us denied.

*E. P. proceeds, viz. 2. We must the more admire your Presumptuous Confidence herein, that you should so affront the Government, except you had at the same Time renounced your former Writings, that so evidently contradict it, p. 3, 4.*

Both

Both which are still to prove, being sincerely denied by us. Our Confidence in what we professed to the Government, was from an honest and good Confidence in the Truth of what we professed, and not to affront, but to answer and satisfy the Government, in what was required of us as Christians, and under a Christian Profession, and therein to be allow'd our just Liberties, both as Men and Christians ( as the Parliament then desired we might approve our selves ); which Christian Reputation you seek to deprive us of, and, like Persecuting Incendiaries, falsely charge us with *affronting the Government in our Profession*, which (God knows) was both Sincere and Christian, both with respect to the *Eternal Deity*, and the *Holy Scriptures*.

E. P. Which way could the Quakers expect to escape being defamed or discredited? Why, it's like they did suppose, That the Honourable Assembly of Parliament had Matters of greater Moment, in Hand, than to compare their former Writings with their new Faith: So that if we had not concerned our selves to peep into their Writings, and compare them with their newly-professed Faith, and published this to the World, namely, That the Quakers former Writings and their late Profession of Faith, are as really alike

*as an Apple to an Oyster, and agree as directly as Light and Darknes, it had not been known, p. 7. Thus far E. P.*

'Tis very rare to find such a Piece of Presumptuous, Proud and Fallacious Insinuation as this, implying not only, that we dissembled a Profession of our *Belief*, in Words, before the Parliament, as directly *contrary to our former Writing as Light is to Darknes*; but that the Parliament was drawn into a Mistake (or deceived) concerning us, by such Dissimulation: Wherefore to undeceive them and the World concerning us, these Adversaries (to make themselves wiser than the whole Parliament, and every Member thereof) have peeped into our former Writings, to find out Matter to Defame and Discredit us in our Christian Profession, before the Parliament. Herein they have acted like Peepers in the Dark; but they have peeped to little purpose, for a Dark Lying Spirit has attended their Peeping (as is clearly in this and our other short Treatise made manifest): And that *E. P.* has but peeped indeed, into some of our former Writings, and not seriously or honestly read them with due Observation, is apparent in his manifold Perversions, Mincings and Curtalizings.

Concern-



Concerning *Primitive Errors and Corrupt Principles in Point of Faith, unduly charged upon the Quakers*, p. 8, 9.

To the first I answer, We never denied the Scriptures to contain the *Words and True Sayings of God*, whereas Christ is the *Word*, his Name is called *the Word of God*, Rev. 19. 9, 13. Exod. 20. 1. But that they are *the Rule*, that is, the *only Rule of Faith, Life and Practice*, as he terms them, p. 8, 17, 33. In that we cannot so call them, he must excuse us herein, until he produce us Plain Scripture, that SO calls them, though the Holy Scriptures be a Rule of Doctrine subordinate to that Spirit from whence they first came. But seeing it is an Article of his Faith, *That the Scriptures are the only Rule of Faith*, &c. He had need to produce plain Scripture, that SO saith; otherwise his Failure therein will be an Indication, That the Scriptures are not the only Rule of his Faith, because there wants Scripture Proof of this great Article of his Faith; and then where's his Faith?

2. Truly I never knew the Quakers affirm the Scriptures to be of NO Use in order to the true Knowledg of God, but that the Holy Scriptures are very useful, with the help of the Spirit of God.

C 4

3. I never

3. I never knew the Quakers hold it a Sin, much less of Idolatry, to take the Practices of the Saints, Recorded, Commanded and Continuing Commands in Force in the Scriptures, for our Examples and *Rules*, because the Spirit of Truth, which is our chief Guide and Rule, does not lead to Reject, but to Own and Follow its own Precepts and Commands, which are in Force in Scripture.

4. I have not known it asserted by our Friends, That *whatever* is commanded in Scripture is no Duty to us, except we receive the Command by immediate Inspiration, as the Prophets and Apostles did; for something commanded in Scripture is, and may be, truly in it self a Duty for all, but cannot be truly understood nor performed without the Assistance and Guidance of the Holy Spirit; and that Spirit will not be wanting to assist in both, as truly heeded.

5. I never knew our Friends, the Quakers (so called) deny the Resurrection of the Just and Unjust, though probably your gross Sense thereof; but we have only pleaded for the Spiritual, Celestial and Glorious Bodies in the Resurrection, as far excelling the Natural, Earthly and Corruptible Bodies, and sincerely believing the Holy Scriptures in that Case,

*Luke*

*Luke 20. 35, 36. Joh. 5. 28. 1 Cor. 15. Hosea 13. 14. Phil. 3. 20.*

6. I never knew our Friends ( the People called *Quakers* ) deny the Body of Christ, that suffered, to be raised from the Grave or Sepulchre, but divers declare their Belief to the contrary; namely, *That his Flesh saw no Corruption* ( or did not Corrupt ) but rose again the Third Day; and that Christ in the same Body Ascended into Heaven; yea also, that he ascended far above *All* Heavens, that he might fill all things.

7. As to that Point of your Water-Baptism, and your Bread and Wine, you must excuse us, we are not yet satisfied that they are *Gospel-Ordinances*, and to continue always in Force, under the Gospel and New Covenant-Dispensation, being a Dispensation of Substance, and not of Shadows; nor do we believe that you Baptists have any immediate Call from Heaven to Baptize People in Water, nor that your observing Breaking of Bread or Drinking of Wine can properly be called the *Lord's Supper*, either in the Figure or in the Substance; yet we do not Despise or Contemn either *Water-Baptism* or *Breaking of Bread* ( as we are falsely accused ) as once practised, nor as observed by such now as are Conscientious therein,  
from

from a Belief that 'tis their Duty to observe the same, we charitably think, they mean well therein, but with they might more mind and partake of the Substance, both as to the Spiritual Baptism and the Bread of Life from Heaven, for their poor Souls Relief, and Safety in Christ the Substance.

8. We never held that pernicious Tenet; of Believing, *That no Blessedness is to be enjoyed by the Saints after Death*, as is most unjustly insinuated against us, from Suggestions grossly false, p. 9. and elsewhere detected.

9. We never denied Justification by Christ's Works, Righteousness and Merits, much less call it a Doctrine of Devils, as we are most horridly belied, p. 9. as is clearly evinced.

10. We are not ashamed to say, and affirm, That Christ is the Light of the World, and that he is that True Light that enlightens every Man coming into the World, and that God is our Light and our Salvation; and is not this Divine Light *within*, think ye? Doth not both God and Christ, in some degree, appear within, to be known within, suppose ye? else how should that which may be known of God be manifest within, seeing there's no knowledg of God but by Christ?

11. And

II. And as to *Billingsgate* Complements charg'd, and for Moderate and Mild Treatment of our Antagonists. The truth on't is, the former I like not, but the latter : I am truly for Moderation and Mildness, even in treating Antagonists, if they are any whit Treatable, Rational or Fair Opponents. But if I find an opposing Adversary guilty of Envy, Lying, Forgeries, gross Perversions, Wrestling and Turning my Words to a contrary Sense than they naturally import or ever was intended by me, then I hope I may tell and shew him his evil and injurious Work, and justly reprehend him for the same, and yet I not be justly deem'd guilty of *Billingsgate* Complements, or Rhetorick either ; for I can make no better of a gross Lye or Forgery than 'tis, nor give it a better Character than it deserves, or that lying Spirit from whence it comes, which I have plentifully met with in *Edw. Paye's* Works of Envy against us, for which I think he justly deserves to be paid off by just Reprehension. And of his *mild Treatment* you may hear anon.

To excuse his envious and scornful Story from our Persecuting Adversaries, the *Westmorland* Petitioners about *Sorcery*, cited in his other Pamphlet against the

the Meetings of the People called *Quakers*, p. 7, 8. *Antichrist in Spirit*. Now *E. P.* faith, viz. For my part, I have seen them *Quake and Foam at the Mouth*, besides several that have been *Eye and Ear-Witnesses* of it, Railings, p. 10.

But neither tells us the Persons, nor in what Meeting or what Place he saw them in both those Postures, nor who else, besides himself, were the *Eye and Ear-Witnesses* thereof: And what reason have we to believe his Testimony any more in this than in many other notorious Falshoods?

And *Corrupt Notions and Deceivable Gestures*, p. 11. he hath not proved against us. But instead of Proof, is now fain to beg Questions, and come to his Supposition, viz. Suppose you formerly used to *Quake, Tremble, Roar, Swell and Foam at the Bull and Mouth in London*, the *Westmorland Petitioners* may say true, &c. p. 11.

See how faintly he comes off, for those *Westmorland Petitioners* and their Story, to render us odious. As for *Quaking and Trembling*, I ask him, If these be the *Deceivable Gestures* which he accuseth us of? And as to *Roaring, Swelling, and Foaming*, which he would fain Insinuate against us, I neither know nor re-



remember these Gestures among our Friends at the *Bull and Mouth Meeting*, or elsewhere in *London*, ever since I knew the Meeting in that place, which has been above 34 Years. *E. P.* grants, *Christ present in Spirit*, but the reason of *Fasting*; his being personally taken from them into the glorious *Heavens* above, beyond the *Stars*, and they obliged to *Prayer and Fasting*, &c. till his second personal Coming, p. 15.

Whereas Christ assigned another cause of *Prayer and Fasting*, even when personally present with his Disciples for the casting out the unclean Spirit, *Mark* 9. 29. and the Apostles approving themselves Ministers in *Watchings*, in *Fastings*, by *Pureness*, &c. *2 Cor.* 6. 5. was not because of Christ's personal or outward absence. And as for your being obliged to *Prayer and Fasting*, 'till Christ's second personal coming, I do not believe you'll fast so long: *G. W.* denies not *Quaking and Trembling*, (quoth *E. P.*) p. 16. And what then? Was that all the Instance the *Westmorland* Petitioners were brought for? Does that prove, either *Sorcery*, or a *Diabolical Spirit*, *Swellings* or *Foamings* in our Meetings, (as they insinuated) or *deceivable Gestures*, as he has accused us? Where proves he *Quaking*

*king and Trembling, (without exception) deccivable Gestures ? Or so called in Scripture ?*

*Pag. 18. E. P. I have, it's true, examin'd the Quakers Appeal, by way of Charge, against Tho. Hicks, wherein they charge him with Lies and Slanders and Forgeries. — And I have perused Mr. Hicks's Answer to their Appeal, where Mr. Hicks clears himself both of Lies and Forgery. I find his Answer to their Appeal subscribed by no less than 22 Persons of Credit, who testify they have Compared Tho. Hicks his Citations with the Quakers Books, out of which they were taken, and find them truly cited.*

Thus far *Edw. Paye*, in Vindication of his Brother *Tho. Hicks*, to regain his long since lost Reputation. Which I did not think any of the *Baptists* would have undertaken to defend at this time aday, especially since he was so publicly and often detected of many Gross and Notorious Forgeries; Besides those few Passages wherein he pretended to clear himself, as his 22 Witnesses also attempted, who were of his own Party, and willing to cover him what they could; but all would not do, they did but thereby disgrace and defile themselves, as we made it plainly appear in a small Treatise,  
En-

Entituled, *The second Treatise wherein the Forgers, Compurgators are Impeached, in a strict Examination of divers Citations and doctrinal Matters, in their Book, Entituled, The Quakers Appeal Answered.* In which Impeachment they are proved both Unfair and False Witnesses, as well as Unjust Judges, even in Matter of Fact, as to Citations. But of this Treatise *E. Paye* takes no notice; but is willing to credit and vindicate his Brother *Hicks*,  
 1. Upon his own Testimony, wherein he is Witness only for himself in his own Cause. 2. Upon the Credit of his 22 Compurgators, who were of his own Party, and willing to say as he would have them, for a cover to himself; whereby they got no good, but shame and disgrace, as is clearly evinced in the said *Second Treatise*.

And many of the said *Hicks* his deceitful Forgeries are discovered both in our Friends Narratives of the Two Meetings with the *Baptists*, in 1674. And also in our Answers to *Hicks*, one Entituled, *The Counterfeit Christian*, and the other, *Reason against Railing*. With more Books, wherein his Deceits, Forgeries and Abuses are detected. And therefore the more shame for *E. P.* thus to credit and justify *Hicks*, as he has done, whom we  
 well

well knew to be a very Envious Person, and so seems this *Paye* very much to resemble him therein, by espousing so many of his Lies as he has done, and now has the more pull'd an old House about his Ears, by owning *Hicks* and his Romantick, Fictitious Dialogues, so much as he has done; so that now *E. P.* is the more bound to stand or fall by *Hicks* his Dialogues, seeing he has so cordially espoused his Interest. And by *E. P.*'s Method of Writing against the People called *Quakers*, we may charge all the *Baptists* and their Society with *Hicks* his Dialogues and *E. Paye*'s disingenuous lying Pamphlets: But some among them, wiser than himself, should consider, whether his Method may be safe or reputable for them.

His crediting and quoting *Hicks* against us, who was a bitter and virulent Adversary, is somewhat like his quoting *J. Faldo*'s confuted Book, stiled, *Quakerism no Christianity*, to support his scurrilous Story from the *Westmorland* Petitioners, viz. That Mr. *J. Faldo* saith, *How generally were their Meetings (viz. the Quakers) either silent or taken up with sudden and violent Eruptions of dismal Howlings and horrid Ravings, Persons suddenly taken as with the Falling sickness, Shaking*  
and

*and Foaming at the Mouth, and some lying flat on the Ground, as if stark dead?*  
P. 15.

Here's a long Queltion, containing strange Stories, but never the truer for his Mr. *J. Faldo's* mis-insinuating them by way of Question, neither are Questions Proofs. But we who have known our Meetings and the Manner of them all along, do know it to be a great untruth. That they were generally taken up with those sudden and violent Eruptions (or Breakings out) mentioned, though many times *silent*, we grant, which is a far different posture from *horrid Ravings, dismal Howlings, Foamings, &c.* But how does your *John Faldo* make out his Story? *E. P.* tells us, *viz. And, saith Mr. Faldo, some Such things as these I have seen and heard.* Which is short of proving *these things*, according to his general accusation against our Meetings; *some such things as these*, are not the same things: Then, How poorly does *E. P.* come off against us herein? Yet fain thus to fly to our Adversaries Books for such Subterfuges, lame Proofs against our Meetings.

But would the *Baptists* be so serv'd? would they take it well to have Books made out of their Adversaries against them?

them? Whereof I could instance not only that stiled, *The Anabaptist wash'd and wash'd, and shrunk in the washing*, long since writ by *Rich. Carpenter, Independent*, (probably as much a friend to the People called *Anabaptists*, as *John Faldo* was to the *Quakers*, or them either) and many others of their Adversaries Books against them (as *E. P.* has done against us) which I presume these *Baptists* now would not take well, nor accept as proof against them; so that in suffering *E. P.* in such his credulous and unfair Dealing, thus to gallop on against us, surely they would not be so dealt by.

*E. P.*'s Story, accusing the *Quakers* out of *Hick's Dialog.* 1. Pag. 24, 25. with saying, *as for us, had the Scriptures never been, we could have known what is therein contained. This (E. P. saith) he hath also heard from their own Mouths, Anti-christ in Spirit, p. 14, 15.*

But in the Name and Behalf of the People called *Quakers*, I deny both *Hick's* and *Paye's* Accusation; and that *he hath heard this from their Mouths*. This I look on as a Lie of his own making, my self and many thousands never spoke those words, nor so believed, viz. that we could have known what (i. e. or whatever all)



all) that is therein contained, &c. we disown the Expressions, as they relate to our selves. And E. P. has varied and fallen from his own Testimony as 'tis general against the *Quakers*. Now to tell us, *He has heard it from a Quaker himself*, in p. 18. of his *Railings and Slanders*: So in one Book 'tis thus, *I have also heard from their own Mouths*. In his other Book, 'tis, *I have also heard this from a Quaker myself*. Thus the Man falters and varies in his own Evidence to defend a *Falshood*. And his unlearned Questions (or rather Challenge) he pretends to be grounded on the said (false) Story against the *Quakers*, they are as impertinent and insincere on his part, namely, to resolve him what those things were that *Jesus* did, that are not written, Joh. 20. 25. or what were the Contents of that Writing on the Ground, Joh. 8. 6, 8. or else let their proud boasting of *Immediate Inspirations* be condemned to perpetual silence.

Which is a sad Sentence, both unnaturally and unjustly deduced from a Proposition made altogether in a disbelief and contempt of the Matter proposed, viz. To resolve all those other unwritten things that *Jesus* did, &c. by immediate

D 2 *mediate*

*mediate Inspiration.* But now the Challenge is altered, and abated too, *Now let him resolve me in some of those things that Jesus did, that was not written, and what was wrote on the ground, and let him or any other Quaker do it either by a Mediate or Immediate Inspiration, or Revelation, p. 21.*

And what follows? If by neither of these ways we can resolve him, then not to pretend to Immediate Inspiration. And yet he himself pretends to *Mediate* or more Common Gifts of the Spirit, and then confusedly tells of the use of these more immediate or common Gifts, p. 19, 20. And yet by these his pretended more immediate or common Gifts of the Spirit, or rather mediate Gifts, in his sense, I presume he cannot resolve himself his Two Questions before, nor can he upon his own Principle either resolve them or be resolved them, either by any *mediate* or *immediate* Gifts. For the *immediate*, he has disclaimed, *he needs it not*, (he says) but pretends the *Scriptures* to be the *Only Rule of Faith*. By what Rule then should he be resolved what those or any of those other things were that are not written? *John 20. 25.* Therefore he has insincerely and temptingly imposed unlearned Questions and Propositions,

positions, which he does not believe can be resolved to his conviction or satisfaction, and thereupon has past unjust Judgment against our having *immediate Inspiration*; & yet in contradiction to himself, tells us of *common and more immediate Gifts and Graces of the Spirit*, and of the *use of these more immediate or common Gifts to help our Infirmities*, p. 19, 20. Altho I presume he would be loath to have his own Judgment and Condemnation against us return'd upon himself, on the same condition. For 'tis certain, *he that has not the Spirit of Christ, is none of his*. And what are these more *immediate Gifts and Graces of the Spirit* he pretends to the use of, seeing he and his Brethren pretend not to *immediate* (or extraordinary) *Inspirations*, p. 19, 20.

There's another Contradiction in the Case, to prove their *Call to Baptize People in Water*. (He saith) *they have a sufficient Call for it from the Commission of Christ our Great Prophet, who is to be heard in all things*, Matth. 28. Mark 16. and the frequent *Examples of his Apostles, &c.* So that we need not *immediate Inspirations for our Call or Authority herein*, p. 21.

*Ans.* Which is to tell us, you may take upon you to be Preachers and Baptizers in Water, without being inspired

by Christ, because he gave a Commission to his Disciples to teach all Nations, baptizing them *eis τὸ ὄνομα*, into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. But,

1. This is no proof, that you are called by Christ to either.
2. Here's no Water mention'd in the Commission.
3. And to baptize *into* that Name, is a work of the Spirit attending a living and spiritual Ministry, given and authorized by Christ himself, which this proves not yours to be, no more, than that the false Prophets were true and truly commissioned, because they said, *thus saith the Lord*; when yet God never spoke to them no more than Christ hath spoke to you to Preach and Baptize with Water; when as you do both without his *immediate Inspiration, Commission, or Spirit*; and consequently you do not hear him in all things.
4. Neither does it follow, that you hear Christ, because you Preach and Baptize People in Water, by imitation of others, whom he sent to Preach and Convert People by his Spirit, where-by they did Minister.
5. You might as well argue, that because *Peter, James, John, and Paul, &c.* were Apostles and Ministers of Christ, therefore *we Edward Paye, and William Allcott, &c.* are Ministers of Christ.
6. If Reading Christ's

Christ's Commission to his Disciples, *Mat. 28. Mar. 16.* be sufficient authority for persons to turn Preachers, and then to tell People they hear Christ, because they read his said Commission, and presume to take it upon them *without* immediate Inspiration from him, why may not the Priests of *England*, &c. be his Ministers as well as you? and why do you dissent from them? Thus we see how you have proved your Call and Authority for what you pretend, even as well as any sensual Impostors, blind Guides and Deceivers may.

On *Rom. 10. 6. 7, 8. E. P. faith, neither did the holy Apostle understand the Word here to be Christ*, p. 22.

*Ans.* How does he answer the Questions then which the Righteousness of Faith gives answer to? Say not in thy Heart who shall ascend into Heaven, that is, to bring *Christ* from above? Or who descend into the Deep, that is, to bring Christ again from the dead? But what faith it? The *Word* is near thee, &c. Is this all one as to say, the Scripture is near thee, even in thy Mouth and Heart? Or was the Enquiry after the Scripture? Who shall ascend or descend to fetch me the Scriptures? No sure: Was not the antecedent Question of Christ? And

surely, none can savingly believe with the Heart, and in true Faith confess with the Mouth, that God hath raised Christ from the dead, so as to be saved, but by that Living Word of Faith in the Heart, which works a true and living Faith therein; and therefore that *Word of Faith*, which begets and works this Faith, is *Christ in Spirit*, who is the Author of this Faith, otherwise the Questions who shall fetch Christ, &c. are not answered. For where, with the Heart, Man believeth unto Righteousness, and with the Mouth maketh Confession unto Salvation, *Rom. 10. 10.* he must needs first feel that Living *Word of Faith* in his Heart to work that Faith in him which produceth that Righteousness in Man which attends Salvation.

'Tis true, that I did complain of *E. P.*'s injurious way of Writing, in accusing us with *giving better or higher Titles to our own Books than to the Holy Scripture*, instancing that of *H. Smith's* Book, where *E. P.* gave these words only for the Title, [*A True and Everlasting Rule*] being but the first words of the Title, and leaving out the next following in the same Sentence, *viz. [From God discovered.]* This I did deem very disingenuous. Now to extenuate and excuse the  
Of-



Offence, he asks me, Does those Words [from God discovered] added to *The True and Everlasting Rule*, diminish the Heighth of the Title? p. 23.

*Ans.* Yes, as the first Part was only (by *E. P.*) attributed to the Book, contrary to the Design of the Title and Matter contained in the Book, to which the Title had plain reference, as taken together entirely, that True and Everlasting Rule, from God discovered, being the Holy Spirit, the Eternal Light and Manifestation of Christ within, or what may be known of God being manifest in Man, plainly testified unto (in the said Book) as that *True and Everlasting Rule*, that was from God discovered; so the Perversion and Abuse is plain.

I think *E. P.* might have spared his Labour of giving the Reader a Breviate of what he Ironically calls, *The Sweet Convincing Language the Quakers use to treat their Antagonists withal*, unless his own Language had been sweeter, and more convincing than it is, and less Partial and Abusive in his Accusations, as to Matter of Fact; wherein he is still general against the Quakers, as if they all treated their Antagonists of all Sorts with such sharp Language, as some have treated a few; and how far they merited severe Treatment

ment from our Friend, concerned he does not know.

The Instances of the Quakers Treatment, *E. P.* gives, are upon *T. Lawson*, *E. Barroughs*, *W. Penn* and *G. Whitehead*, but chiefly on *E. B.* who, in *Scorn*, he terms *Famous*, p. 25. for using the Words *Reprobate*, *Child of Darkness*, *Diviner*, *Antichrist*, *Beast*, *Blind*, *Pharisee*, *Hypocrite*, *Sottish*, &c. These with other Words of like import he has pick'd up among Matters of Controversie; which though the Language be sharp, 'tis not unscriptural; both Prophets of God and Ministers of Christ, (yea Christ himself) did sometime use the like against Wicked Men, who really were such in Spirit and Practice, especially against Envious Persecutors, Deceivers, Hypocrites, &c.

In his accusing *E. B.* hereupon, with *sentencing a Man to Wo and Condemnation for ever (for asking some sober Questions)* p. 26;

Herein he apparently wrongs *E. B.* for 'twas not only for the Questions that he censured him (though they were not sincere nor consistent clear Questions), but as knowing that Adversary to be in *Strife and Envy*, as he declares, f. 31, 32. denounces severe Judgment; 1. Absolutely upon the Envious Persecuting Spirit

Spirit of the Beast in him. 2. Conditionally, upon the Envious Person, leaving *him* room for Repentance : Exhorting him, " To Own and Obey the Light " in his Conscience , that he might " know that Obedience ( of Christ ) " which reconciles to God ; and that by " the same Light he might see his Evil " Deeds, and be led up to Christ, from " whence the Light comes (thus *E. Burroughs*, f. 30, 31, 33. ) Whence it evidently appears, He did not absolutely condemn the Man for ever, but the Beast in him, the evil envious Spirit and Works of it in him ; and this can be no just Occasion for *E. Paye* or *W. Allcott*, to accuse the People called Quakers with having Affinity with the *Muggletonians* in their execrable Imprecations, Curses, &c. as they falsely declare in their *Antichrist in Spirit*, p. 9. For the *Muggletonians* have absolutely Cursed and Damned Persons for opposing them only ; allowing them no condition of Repentance, or of owning or obeying the Light of Christ in them to lead them up to him, as *E. B.* did ; neither does any Just Ground appear from his Words ( as justly distinguished before ) to deduce any such Rude Censorious and Reviling Question, as *E. Paye* and *W. Allcott*, &c. have done,

in

in their *Antichrist in Spirit*, p. 34, 35. Their Reviling (yet mistaken) Question follows.

viz. *Could the Devil himself have been more Vile, and prodigiously Arrogant, to take upon him to Determine a Man's endless Condition?* When it was not the Endless Condition of the Man, but of the Evil Spirit in him, the Beast in him, that *E. B.* absolutely excludes from God for ever; but conditionally declares Judgment upon the envious Man, warning "him, *To own and obey the Light of Christ in his Conscience*; that so he might find Repentance, otherwise Destruction would be his Portion. This Distinction I observe, and clearly find in *E. B.*'s said Answer to *Bennet*: The Matter justly considered is, much like as if a Son of Thunder (stirred up in Zeal, for Truth) should severely Judge and Condemn the Evil Lying Envious Spirit of the Beast and false Prophet in *E. P.* and his Abettors, and unto that Lying Spirit in them, declare, viz. "Thou Envious Lying "Persecuting Beast, thou Foul Wicked "Spirit, thou Malicious Devil and Father of Lyes and Lyars. thou Author "of all Mischief and Discord, thou "Troubler of the Creation, thou Reproacher of God's Heritage, thou that  
" hast

"hast opened thy Mouth in Blasphemy  
 "against God, his Tabernacle, and them  
 "that dwell in Heaven ; thou art utter-  
 "ly cast down and condemned for ever,  
 "and to the Pit thou must return, &c.

And you, in whom this Lying Envious Spirit has so violently appeared against the People of God, to Defame and Reproach them and their Christian Profession : You and your Lyes and Perversions are condemned with the Light of Truth, and you'll come to Shame and Contempt for the same, and utterly perish, if you do not repent ( this is more than a Supposition, 'tis a real Warning to you ) the Lake, which is the Second Death, is, and will be the Portion of all Lyars ; and therefore I exhort you, in love to your poor Souls, Return, Own and Obey the Light of Christ in your Consciences, that will shew you your Evil Deeds, your Hypocrisies, your Falshood and Envy, and lead you to repent of the same, that you may find Mercy and Pardon in Christ, if your Day be not over ; the Spirit of Truth, the Saints Comforter is the World's Reprover, and Judge also of the Prince thereof. Christ's Ministers, who were led by this Spirit, did not wrestle against Flesh and Blood, but  
 against

against *Principalities and Powers*, and Rulers of the *Darkness* of the World, against *Spiritual Wickedness* in High Places, *Eph. 6*. These testified against *Evil Spirits* and Wickedness it self, both in Root and Branches.

The great Degeneracy hath been such in the World, that a Generation of Men have turned Beasts; the Persecuting Envious Spirit of the Beast has made them Beasts, Bulls, Dogs, Foxes, Swine, Wolves, Devourers, Destroyers of others; the Old Serpent has made them Serpents, Vipers, Children of the Devil, &c. These being Characters in Scripture put upon Wicked Men: And it is no hard Matter to shew *E. P.* and his Brethren as severe Judgment and sharp Language given in Scripture to Envious Wicked Persons as *E. Burroughs* gave to his Envious Antagonist before-mentioned, and which I am persuaded is as justly applicable to our present Malicious Adversaries, as to those to whom first directed by the Spirit of true Judgment, in the Servants of God and Christ, as *Pf. 52*. (observe *E. P.* &c. )

1. *Thy Tongue deviseth Mischief, like a sharp Razor working deceitfully, thou lovest Evil more than Good, and Lying rather than to speak Righteousness, Selah. Thou lovest all*



all devouring Words, O thou Deceitful Tongue; God shall likewise destroy thee for ever: He shall take thee away, and pluck thee out of thy Dwelling place, and root thee out of the Land of the Living, Selah.

V. 2, 3, 4, 5.

2. And Isa. 56. 10. His Watchmen are blind, they are all ignorant, they are all dumb Dogs, &c. v. 11. Ye are greedy Dogs which can never have enough; they are Shepherds that cannot understand, they all look to their own way, every one for his gain from his Quarter [as the Covetous Persecuting Priests used to do; and 'tis well if some of you be clear thereof.] And,

3. Ye Serpents, ye Generation of Vipers, how can ye escape the Damnation of Hell? Matt. 23. 33. O Generation of Vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the Wrath to come? Matt. 3. 7.

4. Read also the Epistle of Jude, v. 10. But these speak evil of those things which they know not, but what they know naturally as Brute Beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves. 11. Wo unto them for they have gone in the way of Cain, &c. 12. These are Spots in your Feasts of Charity, &c. 13. Raging Waves of the Sea foaming out their own Shame, wandering Stars, to whom he is reserved, the Blackness of Darkness for ever.

Many

Many other Instances might be given of the Prophets, Christ, his Servants and Ministers, giving severe Judgment against the Wicked. And what think you now, do not these Instances contain as much Sharpness of Language and Judgment (if not rather more) as either the said *E. B.* or any of our Friends have given their Envious Adversaries; and yet 'twere not warrantable to compare them to the *Muggle-tonians*, much less to the *Devil's Vileness* or *prodigious Arrogancy*. The Lord open these Men's Eyes, and soften their hard Hearts, and make them more charitable, if it may yet stand with his good Pleasure.

And I perceiving the very same Bitter Envious Spirit of Persecution in these present Adversaries Pamphlet, styled, *Antichrist in Spirit*, I could do no less than tell them of their Hypocrisy, Envy and Bitterness, their Turbulent Persecuting Lying Spirit, their Gross Lyes and Falshoods, &c. for which I am not condemned of the Lord, nor conscious to my self of Wrong done them, for these Evils are apparent in them, but really believe the Just God will Rebuke and Judge them, and plead our Innocency.

And seeing *Ed. Paye* upbraids us with the Sweet Convincing Language of the Quakers, I will not so unequally retaliate, and say, I shall give the Reader a Breviate of the Sweet Convincing Language the *Anabaptists* use to treat their Antagonists withal: But (to speak in his Terms) of the Sweet Convincing Language which *Edw. Paye* and his Brethren, *Will. Allcott* and *H. Loader*, have treated the People, commonly called Quakers, withal, in their said Pamphlet, *Anti-christ in Spirit*, viz.

“ *Quakerism* a great Delusion, their  
 “ Deceit, their pretended Faith proved  
 “ a Counterfeit (Title) their Profession  
 “ a Labyrinth of Confusion, a Com-  
 “ pound of Heresies, corrupt Notions,  
 “ Equivocal Reserves, Proud Boastings,  
 “ the Pride and Ignorance of *these Impo-*  
 “ *stors, these deluded Impostors, the Qua-*  
 “ *kers, great Enemies to and Contemners*  
 “ *of Holy Scriptures.* The Quakers dream,  
 “ This Generation of *Impostors the Qua-*  
 “ *kers*, who say, Behold he (Christ) is  
 “ *within* thee, to deceive the Hearts of  
 “ the Simple; Horrid Blasphemy. They  
 “ labour to keep a Christian Mask over  
 “ their *Anti-Christian Face; a Bundle of*  
 “ *Blasphemy.* Could the Devil himself have  
 “ *been more Vile.* Why should these Im-  
 E postors

" *passons* talk of the Blood of Christ ?  
 " their Profession but a Painted and De-  
 " ceitful Flourish. The Quakers *Grand*  
 " *Deluders* ; *Blasphemous Absurdities*. By  
 " no means their Word must be taken ;  
 " *blasphemous Confidence*. The Title on each  
 " Page is, [ *Quakerism a great Delusion* ] ;  
 " (above 70. times over) and, *Turn to the*  
 " *Light within*, *saieth the Quaker*, (7. times  
 " over in three Pages, repeated in Derisi-  
 " on, and set in Opposition to Christ's  
 " Doctrine, &c.) The Spirit of Delusion  
 " and gross Ignorance in the Quakers.  
 " These Clouds of Popish Darkness. These  
 " Men care not for the Scriptures, except  
 " it be to abuse them. A Spirit of De-  
 " lusion. Their impertinent Evasions  
 " and manifold Corruptions of the Scri-  
 " ptures. The Quakers are greatly de-  
 " luded. What Horrid Contradictions  
 " and gross Absurdities attend this Spi-  
 " rit of Delusion. The Quakers vainly  
 " feed themselves with Wind, in Ima-  
 " gining that they have the Holy Spirit  
 " who rebel against Christ, condemn his  
 " Blood, despise his Ordinances, &c.

With much more such like Treatment  
 in their said Pamphlet, in pages 8, 16,  
 18, 20, 24, 25, 28, 29, 34, 35, 37, 39,  
 40, 43, 46, 54, 55, 56, 58, 62, 64, 69,  
 70, 71, 75, 76. which as 'tis un-  
 merited,

merited, so it is utterly denyed by us.

Take a View farther of some of *Edw. Pay's Sweet Language*, he treats us withal, to convince us, in his Second Pamphlet, styled, *Railings and Slander detected*, viz.

“ The Folly and Heresies of the Quakers. Quakerism a great Delusion, (in the Title.) Slanderous confused Raileries. *Ill-shapen Cub*. Your Defects in Truth and Reason. Gross and abominable Errors. *All* their Authors Books full of *Railings* and *Blasphemy*, that they have formerly called it a *Doctrine of Devils*; viz. Justification by Christ's Works, Righteousness and Merits (which is an abominable Falshood). I have seen them *Quake*, and *Foam at the Mouth*. Your Corrupt Notions and Deceivable Gestures. Suppose you formerly used to *Quake*, *Tremble*, *Roar*, *Swell*, *Foam*, &c. *G.W.* an old Stickler for Quakerism. *Mr. J. Faldoe* faith, How generally were their Meetings either Silent or taken up with sudden and violent Eruptions of dismal Howlings and horrid Railings, Shaking and Foaming at the Mouth, &c. *G.W.* is so daringly Confident; his Impertinent and Absurd

“Evasions. This small Bundle of Rai-  
 “lery, written by G. W. Like raging  
 “Bears. Their Ragings. The confused  
 “Profession of Faith that G. W. makes,  
 p. 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 22, 24,  
 27, 28, 34.

I am not willing to trouble the Reader  
 in this Place with more of E. P's sweet  
 Treatment, or rather his fowre scurril-  
 ous Contemning, and undeserved De-  
 traction; he had better have let what  
 he calls the *Quaker's Sweet Convincing Lan-  
 guage* alone, than to have reflected so  
 scornfully upon us, unless his own had  
 been sweeter than 'tis, and more Convin-  
 cing and obliging; though I confess this  
 his latter Pamphlet is not quite so bad  
 as the other.



*An Examination of those Exceptions  
and Passages which Edward Paye  
has set opposite, as the Quakers  
Contradictions of their Professi-  
on of Faith, in his said Pamphlet,  
styled, Railings and Slanders de-  
tected.*

Excep. *S* *Smith's Primmer*, p. 9. *They*  
*that are false Ministers preach*  
*Christ without, and bid People believe in*  
*him as he is in Heaven above: p. 29. and*  
*not within also, nor in Peoples Hearts;*  
*they preach Christ without and in Hea-*  
*ven only, excluding him Men's Hearts,*  
*as William Smith's Book shews that to be*  
*his Intention.*

Excep. *Your Carnal Christ.* *Who*  
*wrote? and on what occasion? We know*  
*not: But suppose if any Quaker did,*  
*he struck at some Carnal Imaginations*  
*about Christ; for the true Christ of God*  
*could not be intended, for he is a Spirit-*  
*ual, Divine and Heavenly Christ.*

Exc. *Your imagined God beyond the Stars.*  
*Who hath so writ? I know not, nor on*  
*what occasion; but if any among us*  
*did, the Intent was this, viz. That the*  
*True God is not such a God as you or*

Some Men imagine; he is not an imagined God, limited or circumscribed only beyond the Stars, but is also on this Side the Stars, a Real, True, Infinite, and Omnipresent God, both in the highest Heavens, and lowest Hearts.

'Tis true, I did question some Socinians and Baptists, their defining Christ, under the Terms of a *Personal Being*, a *Human Body*, and consisting of a *Human Body*, asking them what they meant by *Human Body in Heaven*? And if *Human Body* be not an *Earthly Body*? *Appendix to Reason against Railing*, printed in 1673.

P. 21, 22.

This is impertinently alledged against me by E. P. p. 30. whilst he unfairly passeth by and leaves out what I Grant. *Ibid. Reas. against R.* p. 23. "If by *Personal Being* he means a Body distinct from ours, I believe he hath a *Spiritual Glorious Body*, distinct from all these *Earthly Sublunary Bodies*. If by *Personal Being* he means the *Manhood of Christ*, our confessing the Man Christ as Mediator is sufficiently evinced. To the Question then put, *Is the Heavens that must retain him only the Hearts of Men*? My Answer was, It is whom the Heaven must receive, *Act. 3. 21*. And this is above, and larger than

“ than the Hearts of Men. *Reas. against Rail.* p. 24.

Excep. G. F's *Great Mystery*, p. 71. Christ's Nature is not Human which is Earthly; and yet they profess to believe the Humanity of Christ. 'Tis evident by Human, in this Place, he understands Earthly; and therefore esteems it not properly applicable to the Heavenly Man Christ, or his Divine Nature. We may believe the Manhood or Humanity of this Heavenly Man, and yet not his Nature to be Earthly, as the first Adam's was. G. F. in the very same Place alledg'd, confesseth, to “ That we do not deny “ Christ, according to the Flesh, to be of “ Abraham, *Gr. Myst.* p. 71.

Excep. Against G. F. again; Bunion is deceived, who saith, God is distinct from the Saints. By the Words, [Distinct from] here (if not mis-printed) he means Divided or Separated from, as many in common Acceptation understand them; for though God and his Saints be different or distinct Beings, yet not separate or divided one from another.

Excep. See Mr. Hayworth's *Animadversions*, p. 11. One W. Bates a Quaker, said more than once, That what Christ took of the Virgin had now no Being, p. 30, 31. I know not how to credit this Story, which

which *E. P.* is so credulous of, but rather think 'twas a Mistake or Misunderstanding in the Hearers ; for such Words are disowned by us, and therefore not justly to be imputed to us.

*Excep. p. 31.* Mr. Penn's Justification is not by the Imputation of another's Righteousness, but from the actual Performance and Keeping God's Righteous Laws. *Sandy Found. p. 25.* This is not fairly cited ; for the Scripture, *Ezek. 18. 20, 26, 27, 28.* from whence *W. P.* argues is left out, and so are the Words, or *Condemnation*, after *Justification*, and the Word *Laws* added, instead of *Statutes* or *Commandments*. Besides, his Argument is mistaken, for it is not to oppose Salvation or Justification by Jesus Christ his Righteousness, Merits and Works, for there cannot be any true actual Performance or keeping of God's Commandments, by any Person whatsoever, without Christ, or without his Righteousness and Work being partaken of. And did not the Lord say, *He that hath walked in my statutes, and hath kept my judgments, to deal truly, he is just, he shall surely live, Ezek. 18. 9.* And if the wicked will return from all his sins, that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, and

and shall not dye, v. 21. For as the real Righteousness of another belongs not to that Person that's wholly Unrighteous, but the Righteousness of the Righteous shall be upon him only that's truly the Righteous Person, so Christ's Righteousness cannot truly be reckon'd theirs, that have none of It wrought in them; but are wholly Unsanctified and Polluted, for then 'tis his and not theirs. But who are made Just or Righteous by Christ Jesus? Both he and his Righteousness is theirs so far as they are made Partakers thereof. Without Christ we can do nothing; 'tis he that has purchased us to God; 'tis he that works all our Works in us; 'tis he that enables us truly to obey and follow him; and 'tis our Duty to obey him, and to keep his Commandments: So that both the Merit of our Redemption and our Sufficiency for true Obedience is Christ's, and of and in him, and not of our selves.

*Excep. p. 31. E. B's Works, p. 33. God doth not accept any, where there's any Failing, or who do not fulfil the Law, and answer every Demand of Justice.*

Here *E. B.*'s next foregoing words are left out, viz. [*those that love God, keep his Commandments, and they are not grievous*]. Whence it follows, that they  
that

that do not keep his Commandments, do not love him: The Question is, Whether God accepts them that do not love him? 'Tis true, the words, [*For who do not fulfil the Law, and answer every demand of Justice*] seem partly to relate to a state under the Law, according to *James 2. 10, 11. Gal. 3. 10. Heb. 2. 2. Rom. 2. 13.* and partly to that sincere Obedience required under the Gospel, and 'tis certain God accepts none in any disobedience; neither the Law nor the Gospel allows of sinning against God or Christ. [See *Luke 12. 47. Joh. 14. 21. 1 Cor. 7. 19. 2 Cor. 10. 6. Joh. 10. 14. 2 Theff. 1. 8. 1 Joh. 3. 6, 8. 2 Joh. 9.*] But every Disobedience is to be repented of.

*Except. Page 32. Truth's Defence, p. 101. They say, That it is dangerous for Ignorant People to read them (i. e. the Scriptures). That is, such Ignorant People as pervert them to their own destruction; that must needs be dangerous, yet profitable to the Man of God, and those who are guided by his Spirit to the true understanding of them (the Book quoted more fully clears it self). Christ by his Divine Light and Spirit is the Only Rule and Guide of God's People, both in the knowledge of his Di-*



vine Will, and of the Holy Scriptures. Christ is the *Only* Way and Means of Mens coming to walk with God, and the *Only* Rule of Faith and Practice. Christ, who is the Author of living Faith, must needs be the *Only* or Chief Guide, Way and Rule unto his true Spiritual Followers. And this answers most of p. 32, 33.

*Except.* p. 33. See what my Antagonist saith, *Dipper plung'd*, p. 13. and then judge, *If the Scriptures be No Rule, yea, if it be Idolatry to call the Bible A Means, as G. W. expressly saith.* ]

*Obs.* I am very unfairly cited and wrong'd in both these, and 'tis notoriously false, to say *G. W.* expressly saith either that the Scriptures are *No Rule*, or that 'tis *Idolatry* to call the Bible *A Means*; for in the very place quoted, my words expressly are these, *viz.*

1. "By what Rule must we believe  
"that the Scriptures are the *Only Rule* of  
"Faith and Practice, while they no  
"where do call themselves so?

2. To *Tho. Hicks's*, saying that the Bible is *The Means* of our knowing God, *Dial.* p. 41. My Answer was, "He  
"Idolatrously sets up the Bible in the  
"place of Christ, for no Man knows  
"the Father, but the Son, and he to  
"whom the Son reveals him, *Matth.*

11. 27. Now pray observe further.

1. My not granting the Scriptures to be the *Only Rule*, implicitly grants them to be *a Rule*, or some Rule, my Question being on the Word [*Only*] in this case.

2. By my not assenting that the *Bible* (or Books) are *the Means* of our knowing God, I do *not* therefore conclude, that the Divine Doctrine therein contain'd may be no means of our knowing God; for in Christ's hand, and by his opening it to us, and our understandings therein, it may be and is *A Means* of Divine knowledge to us, Christ being the Way and the Means original of Divine and Saving Knowledge.

*Obj. against G. W. again, viz. Who also affirmeth, that Faith grounded on the Scriptures is but an empty implicit Faith, and bespeaks such persons void of the knowledge of God and Christ and Salvation, and that such Men walk by their own Fancies and Imaginations. Quoting [Christ ascended, p. 11.]*

*Observ.* This Baptist has again apparently miscited and wrong'd my Answer; 'twas none of my affirmation, or words, *That Faith grounded on the Scripture, is but an empty implicit Faith, &c.* I affirm they are not my words, but *E. P.'s* fal-

fallacious abuse put upon me : The Case was this, *viz.*

*John Newman*, in his Book, *stiled*, *The Light within*, &c. having affirm'd, p. 45. "That without the Scriptures to be the Rule, we know not that there is any God or Christ or Salvation, &c. all Men are left in the dark, and no man knoweth how to enjoy Life Eternal, neither do we know what God counteth unclean, and what holy; without the Scriptures we know not any Promise, &c.— It leaves men to walk by Fancy and Imaginations. Thus far he : My Answer was, "Poor Men ! You have shewn your selves sufficiently herein, and what an empty implicit Faith you are in, and how void both of the Knowledge of God, Christ and Salvation you are, and how yet in your sins, having denied Christ and his Light within to be your Rule, Way, and Foundation, as he is to his Followers : And so you are walking by your Fancies and Imaginations, who set the Scriptures in the place of Christ, as your only and absolute Rule and Ground of your Faith and Knowledge, &c.

So that I did not own nor grant, that their Faith was really grounded on the Scriptures herein, but on their own unscriptural Fancies and Imaginations, (*vid.*  
*Christ*

*Christ ascend.* p. 12.) contrary to Scripture-Testimony of Christ. And I further oppose their Ignorance of God and Christ thus, viz.

“ And then what a sad Sentence of no  
 “ less than condemnation doth this pass  
 “ upon all People and Nations, who  
 “ have not the Scriptures, as being all  
 “ void of knowledge, that there is ei-  
 “ ther God, Christ, Salvation, Good or  
 “ Evil (without the Scriptures); where-  
 “ as there is a Living Evidence, through-  
 “ out the Creation or Works of God  
 “ therein of the Eternal Power or Maker  
 “ thereof. See *Pf. 19. Rom. 1. Job 12.* and  
 “ many do know and have known these  
 “ things written of (which concern Sal-  
 “ vation) by the Light of God and Christ  
 “ in them that never could read, nor had  
 “ the Scriptures outwardly, as those  
 “ Gentiles which had not the Law, yet  
 “ did those things contained in it, and  
 “ shewed the Effects of the Law written  
 “ in their Hearts, *Rom. 2.* Tho’ the  
 “ Scriptures are profitable to the Man  
 “ of God who hath them, being led by  
 “ his Spirit, which opens them. *Christ  
 ascend,* p. 11, 12.

And now, *E. P.* to prove thy Brethren,  
*W. Allcot,* and *H. Loader’s*, false Charge,  
*That the Quakers contemn and vilifie the*  
 Ho-

*Holy Scriptures*, in their Epistles, and thy own horrid Slanders also; that they are great Enemies to, and Contemners of *Holy Scriptures*, p. 20. of thy *Antichrist in Spirit*.

Thou summeſt up thy Argument with divers *If's*, (but aſſumeſt no Aſſumption purſuant to thy general Charge) as in thy 33 and 34 Pages of thy *Railings and Slanders detected*, thus, viz. Now if the *Scriptures* be a dead carnal Letter, Ink, and Paper, ſaith Parnel: If they are, the Precepts and Traditions of Men, ſaith Naylor, in his Love to the Loſt. If they are no better than an old Almanack, as Holbrow ſaid, Hick's Dial. p. 29. If to ſay an Aſe hath as much Authority eſſentially in himſelf to teach and rebuke, as the *Scriptures*, &c. be not to Contemn and Viſifie them, I am yet to ſeek what is.

*Ans.* The Aſſumption or Minor Proposition intended (i. e. but the *Quakers* ſay all theſe of the *Holy Scriptures*) is here wanting, and the Argument is lame and fallacious, as well as falſly ſtated alſo in the firſt Proposition, being not in the terms of the Charge.

For 1<sup>ſt</sup>, The Charge is general againſt the *Quakers*, That they are great Enemies to and Contemners of the *Holy Scriptures*, yet the word [*Holy*] not men-

mentioned in the particular Instances fallaciously alledged for proof, though it be in the general Charge.

2. If some of the Instances were true, yet to charge them upon the People called *Quakers* in general, is an absurd and unjust way of arguing, a *particulare ad universale*, and no better than to argue thus, "If *Edw. Paye*, (the *Baptist*) has "raked up and charged divers of *Hicks's* "Lies and *Forgeries* upon the *Quakers*, "and added many more of his own to "them, then the *Baptists* are all Forgers: "But *Edw. Paye* hath so done, (is apparent) *Ergo*, They may justly deny the *Major*, though the Assumption (or Charge) alone stands good, being plentifully proved against *E. Paye* in particular.

3. Neither are the particular Instances true in fact; the Holy Scriptures are not a dead Letter in the *Quakers* esteem, tho' none of us ascribe *Holiness* to Ink and Paper or the dead Characters, but to the living Divine Precepts and Doctrine therein contained; nor did we ever think the *Holy Scriptures to be but the Precepts and Traditions of Men*; or (much less) *no better than an Old Almanack*, as the People called *Quakers* are most unjustly accused by these Adversaries, *Antichrist*



*Antichrist in Spirit*, p. 18. And 'tis far from J. N. or any of us either, to say or think, that an *As* hath as much Authority *essentially* in himself to teach and rebuke, as the Holy Scriptures. For shame, E. P. retract and leave off such foul, gross and horrid Lies and Reproaches against the People called *Quakers*.

To prove, that we name (or call) *the Holy Scriptures, the Precepts and Traditions of Men*, (charged against the *Quakers* in general) *Antichrist in Spirit*, p. 18. Thou, E. P. hast repeated this again in thy *Railings*, p. 33. and quotest *James Nayler's Love to the Lost* for it, but not in what Page; and therefore I have been at the pains to view over that Book, to see if I could find any such words, but find nothing like them, but the contrary; namely, 1<sup>st</sup>, "That the words of  
 "the Scripture were given forth from  
 "the *Light*, which he calls the *Eternal*  
 "Light, *Love to the Lost*, p. 4, & 20,  
 "21. And that the Ministers of Christ,  
 "who have the Word, who are begot-  
 "ten by the Word, through such came  
 "the Scriptures, which came not by the  
 "Will of Man, but by the Spirit, and  
 "so are of no private Interpretation,  
 "*Love to the Lost*, p. 73. which Spirit is  
 F "the

“the *Eternal Spirit*, the Spirit of Light  
 “and Truth, p. 13, 18. Thus J. N.  
 All which is far enough from calling or  
 esteeming the *Holy Scriptures but the Pre-  
 cepts and Traditions of Men*, as most un-  
 justly is charged upon the *Quakers*, by  
*E. P.* and consequently by his appro-  
 vers, *William Allcott*, and *Henry Loader*,  
 who had need to retract this and the rest  
 of their Charges, which are notoriously  
 false in fact.

And *E. P.* thou hast no cause to boast  
 or insult over us, touching the Writings  
 and Sayings of our ancient Authors,  
 which thou hast so foully wrong'd and  
 perverted; and when thou hast made  
 Lies upon them, then falsely to say, *they*  
*directly contradict the Quakers new Faith*,  
 when by deceitful Perversions, false Ci-  
 tations, base and falacious Forgeries,  
 thou hast attempted such Contradiction,  
 as thy self and abettors may for ever be  
 ashamed of, and hast great cause to re-  
 nounce and explode the same, rather  
 than we our ancient Friends Writings.  
 And to evince thy contempt and scorn,  
*thou shalt take no notice at all of the confused*  
*Profession of Faith that G. W. makes, p.*  
*34.* No, thou art too big, too great,  
 too high in thy own proud Conceit, to  
 take notice of what such a mean con-  
 temptible

temptible person as *G.W.* or any of us testifies of our Belief, how sincere soever. But I must tell thee, if thou goest on in this, thy wicked Course of Defaming and Scandalizing us, I hope we shall take further notice of thee and thy base malicious Work, to thy own and abettors perpetual shame, to keep your Infamy in remembrance ; and when we have fully cleared our Consciences, I doubt not but the Righteous Judge of all (whose People thou hast evilly entreated and reproach'd) will meet with thee, and rebuke thy Envious Spirit.

To extenuate thy notorious Lie and Forgery against *Geo. Fox*, of taking the Name of the Eternal Judge of quick and dead to himself, quoting p. 6, 7. of *Saul's Errand*. Now thou art fain to beg the Question, viz. Why may not *G. F.* take the Name to himself, as well as approve of those blasphemous Titles given him by *Jos. Coal*, in his Letters from Barbadoes? p. 35. cited in *Antichrist in Spirit*, p. 43, 44.

*Ans.* The Charge here (of approving and giving blasphemous Titles) is very high against two persons deceased, who (we believe) ended their days in peace ; and my present Answer is, 1<sup>st</sup>, I have cause to question, whether the said Letter be truly and intirely copied or cited

from the Original, by thee *E. P.* 2<sup>dly</sup>, I do not believe 'tis an intire Copy. 3<sup>dly</sup>, Whence hadst thou thy Copy and Credit thereof? And what Persons (that are no Parties nor Adversaries to us) will attest thine to be true and an intire Copy, according to *Jos. Cole's* original Letter? 4<sup>thly</sup>, If thou canst not produce the Original, then what validity is thy Charge of, if the Credit of all the Copies thou canst produce, be called in question, for want of impartial Witnesses, or the Original to compare them with? For I do really question the truth of thine; and when thou givest an unquestionable Copy thereof, probably I may give a further Answer; for I doubt not but I can clear that honest Man, *Jos. Cole*, from giving any *blasphemous Titles*, and that from his own printed Testimonies, and *G. F.* also from receiving; by his known publick Christian Profession unto *Christ Jesus*, both as God and Man, according to the Holy Scriptures. And where and when did *G. F.* say in a Meeting, *I have power to bind and to loose whom I please?* p. 36. What Meeting, and who are Witnesses of this Story? I do not believe it.

To prove *E. P.'s* false Charge, That they (i. e. the Quakers) say, that *Christ*  
h ath

*hath no Body but his Church, Antichrist in Spirit, p. 29. (This being shewn not to be the Quakers Saying, but something like it, objected against One Person, by some persecuting Priests, as in Saul's Errand, p. 2.) Now E. P. again is fain to beg the Question and shuffle, viz. And why may not G. F. deny Christ to have a personal Body, besides or distinct from his Church, as well as G. Whitehead? Dip. pl. p. 13.*

*Ans.* I am the Person here falsely accused again, they are none of my words, or negation, nor so much as mention'd in the place quoted in *Dipper plung'd*, p. 13. but the terms [*God-man, a person without thee*] question'd as not Scripture-Language, answered before; which was not on the Question, Whether Christ hath a Body distinct from his Church? Also answer'd presently.

Whereas *E. P.* objects against what I said in answer to *Tho. Jenner's* saying, *Christ sitteth at the right-hand of God in Heaven with a Natural Body.* And accusing us with saying, *Christ hath but one Body.* *E. P.* should have been so ingenuous as to have recited my whole Answer in that case, in our *Apology*, p. 33. quoted by him, p. 37. and that will clear me from his impertinent Objection

against the words, *viz.* They should produce Scripture, that say Christ hath two Bodies. (Here *E. P.* leaves out) [*a Natural and a Spiritual*] which is very unfairly done. And in the Question, *Where doth the Scripture say, that Christ's glorified Body in Heaven is of Human Nature?* After [*Is*] he leaves out [*a Natural Body*] and [*as his terms are*] whereby I grant, that Christ hath a *Spiritual Glorious Body* of his own. Also *E. P.* takes no notice of my Explication in these words, *viz.* "If *T. Jenner* supposeth, "that we intend the Natural Bodies of "Men to be the Body of Christ, without distinguishing between them, he "is mistaken, for the Natural Body and "Spiritual Body are two. — And if "Christ's Body in Heaven be *Natural*, "whose Body is it that is *Spiritual, Glorious, &c?* is it Christ's, yea, or nay? And I further add in my Answer, *Apol.* p. 34. "If so be Christ's Body in Heaven be *Natural*, then where the Apostle said he shall change the Body of our lowliness, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious Body, *Phil.* 3. "This were all one, in *Jenner's* sense, as "to say he shall change and fashion our Body (which is *Natural*) like unto his *Natural Body, &c.*

By



By all which I grant Christ's own glorious Body in Heaven distinct from those natural Bodies of Men on Earth ; though I must own a *Spiritual Union* or Oneness between *that* and his Church, so as his Body in its Fulness is but One Body. And in my *Appendix to reason against Railing*, p. 23. I plainly confess I believe "he hath a Spiritual glorious Body, distinct from all these earthly sublunary Bodies.— and that the Heaven, that must receive him, is *above* and larger than the Hearts of Men, *Append.* p. 24.

To E. P.'s repeating, that J. Parnell calls *Water-Baptism*, a formal Imitation and Invention of Men ; and now addeth, that He ( J. P. ) saith so, p. 37. whereas it was plainly shewn him, that he did speak this of *Sprinkling Infants*, which E. P. calls *Baptism* ; and yet saith, the Name *Anabaptists* belongs not to them, p. 13. And why so? If *Sprinkling Infants* be *Baptism*, are you not *Anabaptists*, when you Re-baptize them, or Baptize them again ? and yet I did not call you *Anabaptists* on that score, nor in *derision*, as is wrongfully suggested, p. 12. but only for distinction-sake, my words at first being [*the People commonly called Anabaptists*,] p. 1. 'Tis far from me to design any derision, or to put any ridicule upon the People

so called from *E. Paye's* particular abuses; for I hope as some of them are more honest than himself, so many of them will be ashamed of his malicious Pamphlets, tho' he pretends *the Approbation of several* since, p. 38. which we have little cause to credit, without their own testimony; for some eminent among that People, have declared their dislike of his work already. And it will be far more for their credit and reputation, to stop him from his scribbling to defame others, than to suffer him to persist therein.

And as to his *Challenging any to charge and prove against him any thing unbecoming a Man and a Christian, respecting either Life or Principles, Human Frailties excepted*, p. 38. I ask him, if to bear false witness against his Neighbours, to belie, slander and defame them, to take up reproaches against them, to pervert and corrupt their words, to gather up, credit and publish their Adversaries malicious Defamations against them, (all which *E. P.* is proved notoriously guilty of) be either becoming a Man or a Christian? or be to do as he would be done unto? (What an easie matter is it for a wicked person to write malicious Pamphlets at that rate?) Or must these Enormities be reputed only as Human Frailties? Will his Religion

gion and Conscience allow him to slander, to lie, to defame others, and yet for all that to be a moral Man and good Christian, and Minister to others? I am sure the just God will not so esteem him nor any one else in such a state.

Upon a serious View and Observation of the Method which he *E. Paye*, &c. has taken up against the People commonly call'd *Quakers*, I find it thus, 1. To quote and cite divers of their Adversaries Invectives against them. 2. To mis-cite and abuse some of their own Authors Books and Writings against them, sometimes leaving out the most emphatical Expressions in the middle, and sometimes in the end of a Sentence, and many times the most explanatory part of their Answers, thereby greatly altering, perverting and corrupting matters, contrary both to the Authors own Words and Expressions. 3. To invent and forge notorious falsehoods, contrary to our express Christian Profession and Perswasion. 4. From such indirect and unjust Premises, to draw his own perverse and evil Consequences against the People called *Quakers* in general, to render them and their whole Society and Profession as odious and obnoxious as he can. 5. Divers of his Authors, to whom he has given credit, and

and whose odious defamations he has raked up against us, were persecuting Priests, and others of party with them, who were as much enemies to the *Baptists* as to us, and long since answered and refuted. 6. He is so credulous, as he seems to take all for granted that such Adversaries have maliciously writ against us; but in many cases takes no notice of our Answers to them; and where he doth, he is very subject to pervert, mince, curtailize and abuse them as before.

Now I am perswaded the Ministers and People of the baptized Societies, would not be thus served after such injurious Methods. And to me, and divers others, 'tis a wonder that those Ministers and Elders of that Society who appear more discreet and judicious (than this injurious Adversary, *E. P.*) do not give a severe check to him, and put a stop to his perverse and contentious Scribling, (tending to Strife, and to aggravate Divisions, and cause Animosities among Neighbours, and to make Breaches wider among People) and rather seek Peace, Mutual Love and Charity among all; for I must tell them, these crooked Methods which *E. P.* takes will be no small disrepute and disparagement to them that are of the same Society with him, or that own him as a Brother or Minister among them.

And since in conclusion of his last, he has given us a Threat, (as if he would frighten us) *That if he be foolishly provoked, we may it is like have a quarterly Packet, to keep our Fame in remembrance.*

And truly if he will be so foolish, as to be foolishly provoked, or to make a foolish Provocation the ground of his Packets or Pamphlets against us, we shall have little cause to be affrighted or deterred by his Threat from making our Just Defence; and now, since he has so loudly alarum'd us, he has given us occasion to watch him

him narrowly and warily, really believing he'll make no great earnings of such his undertaking, nor advantage of his atchievements, but bring Infamy upon himself, and an unnecessary Charge upon others, and be no small Disparagement to his own Society.

I have traversed the Controversies long since, and I bless God, that he has made me a Witness for his Truth and for Christianity in Life and Power ( even from my Youth upward ) against Deceit, Envy and Hypocrisie, that I have seen in these our Adversaries and Opposers ; what personal Detractions or Reflections I meet withal, I value not, my Innocence and Christian Conversation, being well known to many and my inward Peace with the Lord in my own Conscience ; but wherein I find the Truth abused, and God's Heritage reproached, I am constrained in God's holy Fear and Zeal to stand up for Truth, and in its Vindication, against its Adversaries and Gainsayers and their Contradictions, and hope ever shall, so long as the Lord gives Life and Ability.

And I humbly thank the Lord my God, who hath hitherto helped and supported me, and many more, in his Work and Service, and in Christian Love and Good-will towards all Men.

**G. Whitehead.**

The

## The Conclusion.

**I** Have hitherto been mostly on the Defensive Part, to remove these Adversaries Calumnies and Misrepresentations of our Principles, much I have to except against divers of their Unsound Doctrines, particularly about the great stress they lay on their *Water-Baptism*, and what they call *The Lord's Supper*; 'tis easy to make it appear that they exactly run parallel with the *Rhe-mists*, in the manner of their defending ther *Water-Baptism*, and the great Weight they place upon it, contrary to Scripture, and the Doctrine of the Ancient Protestants.

Please to take a View of some of these Baptists Doctrines, and some brief Observations and Questions upon them, as followeth.

1. *That by Baptism (i. e. Water-Baptism) we must put on Christ, and so become Members of his Mystical Body, Heirs of the Promise of the Holy Spirit, &c.* Antichrist in Spirit, p. 69.

*Obser.* This is Popish Doctrine, and contrary to the Apostle's; See 1 Cor. 12 13.

2. *That the highest Attainments or greatest Measures of the Holy Spirit, do but fit Men for Gospel Ordinances,* p. 64. Whereof their *Water-Baptism* is rendred a *Sacred or Holy one*, p. 57, 63.

*Qu.* Where doth the Scriptures say, That the highest Attainments of the Holy Spirit do but fit Men for *Water-Baptism*? as if that were higher than those Attainments, or the Spirit Inferior to the Element of Water.

3. But in contradiction to themselves herein, they tell us, That *Water-Baptism is the initiating*  
and



and ingrafting Ordinance, whereby the Penitent Believer puts on Christ, p. 68.

*Obf.* For which they quote and misapply *Gal. 3. 27.* which shews, That it is by Faith in Christ Jesus that they were Children of God, being baptized into Christ, v. 26, 27. and *Rom. 11. 19, 20, 23.*

4. That there is but one Baptism in a full and proper Sense, and that is that of Water, in which the Penitent Believer is Buried, for which they unduly quote *Coll. 2. 12. Rom. 6. 4.* and on *Eph. 4. 5.* say, To be Baptized with Water is the one Baptism. *Pa. 66, 67.*

*Obf.* This appears directly Popish Doctrine, and accordingly held by the *Rhemists*, contrary to the Protestants, and wholly excludes Christ's Baptism by the Holy Spirit.

5. *1 Pet. 3. 21.* Applied to Water-Baptism, as the Baptism that doth now save us, the End whereof is the Answer of a good Conscience towards God. p. 67.

*Obf.* If Water-Baptism be the one-saving Baptism, then out of the Baptist's-Church there is no Salvation: This is not only Popish but contrary to that very Scripture, *1 Pet. 3. 2.* that Saving Baptism being not the putting away the Filth of the Flesh, &c.

6. That our saying, Water-Baptism was a Figure of the Spiritual, is an apparent Falshood, p. 68.

*Ob.* No, 'tis an apparent Truth, John's Baptism was a Figure of Christ's Saving Spiritual Baptism and Washing of Regeneration; See *Matth. 3. 11. Mar. 1. 8. Luke 3. 16. Joh. 1. 26, 27. Tit. 3. 5, 6.*

7. That Christ is not come, because that Kingdom is not come that Christ speaks

of \*; I will not henceforth drink of the fruit of the Vine, 'till I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom, *Matt. 26. 29. Luke*

\* Contrary to Christ's own Testimony, *Matt. 16. 28. Mark 9. 1. Luke 9. 27.*

22. 18. p. 73. compared with p. 74. In that Kingdom

dom they neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither can they dye any more, Luk. 20. 35, 36.

*Qu.* How then shall they drink new Wine with Christ in that World to come, and in that State wherein they shall be equal with the Angels of God in Heaven, suppose ye? And as neither can they dye any more, so neither shall they Hunger nor Thirst any more, Rev. 7. 16. *Isaiah* 49. 10. What occasion for New Wine then?

8. *That his Disciples upon Earth are to Break and Eat Bread, and Drink of the Fruit of the Vine till he come, to wit, in a Personal, Glorious and Visible manner, Phil. 3. 20.--- Who shall change our vile Bodies, and make them like his own glorious Body, at Christ's second personal coming visible in his Body of Flesh and Bones, p. 73, 74.*

*Qu.* And shall those glorious Bodies then have occasion to drink New Wine with Christ, in his Father's Kingdom, do you think? or are you not rather too Carnal in your Expectations, in this Matter, whilst you mean literally? and then do you not delay and put off the Spiritual Eating and Drinking with Christ ( *Rev. 3. 20. Luke 22. 30.* ) in his Spiritual Kingdom?

9. *No Christians can allow them (i.e. the Quakers) that Christ is come the second Time, p. 74.*

*Obs.* Yes, true Christians can allow it, tho' these Baptists cannot, wherein they contradict the true Believers Expectation and Experience of Salvation by Christ's coming, *Heb. 9. 28. Tit. 2. 13. 14.*

10. *That the Quakers say they are perfect, viz. without Sin [ this is not true by the way, but that to be so is both required of us in this Life, and attainable in Christ Jesus ] but Christians expect complete Perfection, that is, a living without Sin, (as 'tis explain'd by E. P. Rail. and Slan. p. 38.) when they come to glory on the other side of the Grave, &c. p. 51.*

*Qu.* When do these Men expect to be made clean,  
in

in the Grave or at their expected Resurrection unto Glory ? If not until they are in their Graves, they dye in their Sins, and then whither Christ is gone they cannot come, *Joh. 8. 21.* If not until such their expected Resurrection, what shall become of their Sins, inherent Pollutions and Defilement between their Death and Resurrection ?

A few more of their Unsound and Antichristian Doctrines about *Inspiration, Christ within, his Kingdom, and Light within.*

1. *That if the Quakers by their immediate Inspirations do not resolve what those many other things were that Jesus did, that are not written, Joh. 21. 25. and what were the Contents of that Writing on the Ground, Joh. 8. 6, 8. then their boasting of immediate Inspiration is to be condemned to perpetual Silence and shame to cover their Faces.* Antichrist in Spirit, p. 15, 16.

*Contradiction. Things that are Secret and not written, not at all belonging to us but to the Lord; as in E. P. Rail. and Slan. p. 20.*

*Obs.* There they have imposed such a Proof of immediate Inspiration upon us, as doth not at all belong to them, if things not written do not all belong to them.

2. On *Matth. 24. 26.* they say, 'Tis more than probable that Christ pointed at this Generation of Impostors, the Quakers, who say, Behold he, Christ, is within thee, &c. p. 25.

*Obs.* Antichristian Doctrine, contrary to Christ and his Apostle's Doctrine, *Joh. 17. 23. 2 Cor. 13. 5. Coll. 1. 27. Rom. 10. 6, 7, 8.*

3. *That those that are in the Possession of that Kingdom (viz. the Kingdom of Christ) neither Marry nor are given in Marriage, &c. but the Quakers do Marry, ergo, not in possession of that Kingdom, p. 51, 52.*

*Obs.* Marriage in the Lord hinders not his People from the Enjoyment of Christ's Kingdom, therefore the first Proposition and Conclusion of this

this Argument is contrary to plain Scripture, Coll.  
 1. 13. Rev. 1. 9. Matt. 16. 28. Mar. 9. 1. Luk. 9. 27.  
 4. That the Disciples did not expect this Christ to  
 come into them: Namely, "This Christ, the Pro-  
 phet, whom ye shall hear in all things, Deut.  
 18. 15. Acts 3. 22. He, of whom God the Fa-  
 ther, from Heaven, testified, Matt. 17. 5. This  
 "is my beloved Son, hear ye him. This Christ that  
 "was Crucified and Rose from the Dead, Luke 24.  
 "39. This is he that told Mary, Job. 20. 19. I go  
 "to my Father and your Father, to my God and your  
 "God. [Hereupon these Baptists affirm as before]  
 the Disciples did not expect this Christ to come into  
 them, p. 52, 53.

Qu. What Christ then? Is there two Christs!  
 (See 1 Cor. 8. 6.) Is not this Antichristian Do-  
 ctine, contrary to Christ's own express Testimo-  
 ny, Job. 14. 20. 17. 23. And to these Baptists  
 own Confession, on 2 Cor. 13. 5. c. 5. 17. 1 Cor.  
 6. 19. Coll. 1. 27. Ro. 8. 9. Eph. 2. 22. p. 22, 23.  
 5. Turn to the Light within, saith the Quaker.

This these Baptists have in contempt repeated  
 seven times over in less than three Pages (and all  
 under the Title of Quakerism a great Delusion) to  
 prove that the Quakers disown the Doctrine taught by  
 Christ and his Apostles, and that they oppose the Teach-  
 ings of Christ's Prophetical office, p. 54, 55, 56.

Obs. Here they have opposed and condemned  
 the Doctrine of God's Prophets, Christ and his  
 Apostles, who were all for (and preached) the  
 Light within; see Ps. 56. 13. Isa. 2. 5. Jer. 12.  
 36. 1 Jer. 1. 7. and 2. 15. Acts 26. 18. and how  
 can the Light of Christ within either oppose his  
 Doctrine Ministry or Offices? And 'tis no other  
 Light we exhort People to turn to. The Lord  
 open these Men's Eyes, that they may come out  
 of Darkness; which they cannot do, unless they  
 turn to the Light within.

F I N I S.

